REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 056 24 EA 001 093

THE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS. VOLUME III, THE STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

BY- CARTER, RICHARD F. AND OTHERS
STANFORD UNIV., CALIF., SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

REPORT NUMBER CRP-1039 PUB DATE 30 JUN 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0352
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.50 HC-$16.12 401P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUPERINTENDENTS, SPECIAL PROGRAMS, SPECIAL SERVICES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PERSONNEL POLICY, ELECTIONS, PARENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP, PUBLIC OPINION, COMMUNITY RESOURCES, *CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, COMMUNITY LEADERS, *SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, MASS MEDIA, FACTOR ANALYSIS, *POLICY FORMATION, *COMMUNICATIONS, STANFORD, PROJECT CAST,

TO EVALUATE STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, 860 VARIABLES WERE DEFINED FROM THE LITERATURE AND GROUPED INTO 26 DIVISIONS FOR ASSESSMENT AGAINST FOUR SUMMARY CRITERION VARIABLES--(1) ACQUIESCENCE, THE DEGREE TO WHICH VOTERS IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT VIEW FINANCIAL ISSUES FAVORABLY, (2) PARTICIPATION, THE DEGREE TO WHICH VOTERS EXERCISE THEIR RIGHT OF REVIEW BY VOTING, (3) UNDERSTANDING, THE DEGREE TO WHICH INFORMED OBSERVERS SIMILARLY PERCEIVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS, AND (4) QUIESCENCE, THE DEGREE TO WHICH CONTROVERSY AND CONFLICT ARE LACKING IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY WERE BASED ON DATA FOR A RANDOM NATIONAL SAMPLE, DRAWN BY THE CENSUS BUREAU, OF 180 SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH 150 PUPILS OR MORE, WITH THE PROBABILITY OF SELECTION PROPORTIONAL TO SCHOOL ENROLLMENT. TEN PERSONS HOLDING KEY ROLES WERE QUESTIONED IN EACH DISTRICT--SUPERINTENDENT, BOARD PRESIDENT, FOUR OTHER BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHER REPRESENTATIVE, PARENT REPRESENTATIVE, MASS MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE, AND AN INTERESTED CITIZEN. FACTOR ANALYSES OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES, CENSUS DATA (1940, 1950, AND 1960), AND SCHOOL RECORDS IDENTIFIED 256 VARIABLES AS SIGNIFICANTLY RELATED TO ONE OR MORE OF THE FOUR CRITERION VARIABLES. WHILE THE STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS SERVED PRIMARILY AS A BASIS FOR THE SUBSEQUENT PROCESS ANALYSIS DESCRIBED IN VOLUME 4, PRACTICAL USES OF THE STUDY'S IDENTIFICATION OF KEY STRUCTURAL VARIABLES INCLUDE BOTH THE DIAGNOSIS AND THE SOLVING OF PROBLEMS IN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS. THIS IS PART III OF A SERIES. RELATED DOCUMENTS INCLUDE EA 001 091, EA 001 092, EA 001 094, AND EA 001 095. (JK)

ED017056

BR 5-0352
PA 24

THE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

By

RICHARD F. CARTER, LEE RUGGELS, AND RICHARD F. OLSON

with

DAVID T. TRONSGARD, ROBERT CALLAHAN,
ROBERT KIRKPATRICK, DONALD KENNY, JOHN TAYLOR,
GEORGE COMSTOCK, DAVID WILLEY, AND JOHN TOSCANO

VOLUME III

PROJECT: CAST
THE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
1966

EA 001 033

Project: CAST

The Structure and Process of School-Community Relations

VOLUME III

The Structure of School-Community Relations

by

Richard F. Carter, Lee Ruggels, and Richard F. Olson
with
David T. Tronsgard, Robert Callahan,
Robert Kirkpatrick, Donald Kenny, John Taylor,
George Comstock, David Willey, and John Toscano

A Technical Report from the
School of Education,
Stanford University,
Stanford, California

June 30, 1966

Cooperative Research Project No. 1039

William R. Odell and Richard F. Carter, Directors

The research reported herein was performed pursuant
to a contract with the U.S. Office of Education,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Preface

We undertook this study knowing that we would need help from many. Now that we are done, we know even better just how many did have to help and the benefits we derived.

The formulation and execution of the work were tasks of some magnitude, as indicated by the multiple authorship -- and the responsibilities entailed.

In addition, we had the assistance of five educational experts who convened early in our work to advise us on our conceptualization of the study. These were: Roald F. Campbell, Jacob W. Getzels, Roy M. Hall, Andrew W. Halpin, and Roy K. Wilson. We were also assisted then, and later, by our colleagues: H. Thomas James, Wilbur Schramm and William Strand.

Collection of data across the country was greatly facilitated by the assistance we received from two national research agencies: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; and, National Analysts, Inc., Philadelphia. We deeply appreciate the personal efforts of Morris Axelrod and Beverly Clifford of the Survey Research Center, and of John Monroe representing National Analysts, Inc.

Research assistants who aided us in the processing of data were: Jack Alexander, Harold Dyck, Robert Ellis, Robert Evans, Douglas Fuchs, Mark E. Lewis, Ronald Pyszka, Anthony Scantlen, and Phillip Tichenor.

Our secretarial staff consisted of: Esther Huang, Annabelle Johnson, Joyce Fasnacht, Cynthia Stabb, Gay Quarles, and Dana Morris.

Finally, we should like to acknowledge our debt to the administrator of this project, William R. Odell.

RFC
WLR
RFO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface i

General Introduction 1

Introduction to Part I 15

Part I

I Administration 26
II Students 45
III Program 56
IV Services 65
V Staff: Teachers 71
VI Staff: Others 85
VII District Characteristics 90
VIII Policies and Procedures: Staff 95
IX Policies and Procedures: Students 106
X Policies and Procedures: Fiscal 111
XI Policies and Procedures: Elections 118
XII Policies and Procedures: Information 130
XIII Parents 138
XIV Public: General 144
XV Community Characteristics 150
XVI Voter Characteristics: Participation 195
XVII Voter Characteristics: Critics 200
XVIII Voter Characteristics: Values 212
XIX Community Leadership: Individuals 216
XX Community Leadership: Groups 221
XXI School-Community Relationships 228
XXII Board of Education 233
XXIII Citizens' Committees 248
XXIV Mass Media 255
XXV Fiscal 263
XXVI Information 268

Summary of Retained Variables 272

Appendix A: Instruments 287

Appendix B: Estimation Procedures for Demographic Variables (by George Comstock) 368

General Introduction

With control of public education still vested largely in local hands, the character and the results of educational policy determination depend to a great extent on the nature of local school-community relations.

What affects school-community relations has an impact on the way in which educational policy is determined, and on whether support will be voted for its implementation.

There are two ways to look at the nature of school-community relations. Its structure is imposing. There are hundreds of factors that may enter into school-community relations. Its process is questionable. It can be viewed as a complex interaction of the myriad factors. But it can also be seen as a fairly simple political interaction between school leaders who exercise day-to-day initiative and the public which votes in occasional review of policy.

However one looks at school-community relations, as structure or process, the lack of information available becomes immediately evident. Anecdote and research study alike point only to particular aspects of school-community relations. There is no comprehensive study of it, no knowledge with which one could alter it except by trial and error attempts to modify a factor considered especially significant.

It was to improve this situation that we undertook this study of the structure and process of school-community relations. We have tried to obtain a comprehensive picture of the factors which may enter into school-community relations, and to obtain a picture of how these factors interact in the process of school-community relations.

The origin of this study goes back nine years to our first work in school-community relations. Our concern then was the role of understanding in the support of public education. That first study was an example of focusing on one factor considered significant in school-community relations.[1] But before we had finished, we were well on the way toward seeing the complexity of school-community relations.

Six years ago we began this current study, tailored to the demands on resources necessitated by the scope of the problem. To introduce this study, we can do no better than to go back to the results and shortcomings of the previous study.

We conceptualized that first study in a rather elementary way. We took success or failure in school financial elections to be the criterion of school-community relations. We postulated understanding to be a condition antecedent to success. Then we looked for a means of observing the relationship of understanding to success.

The schematic diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the view of school-community relations with which we worked.

Figure 1. A Schematic Diagram of School-Community Relations.

F_1 ...	PF_1 ...			
F_2 ...	PF_2 ...			
F_3 ...	PF_3 ...	Understanding	Policy	Success of Financial Election
...	...			
F_n ...	PF_n ...			

In Figure 1, the F_n elements represent the factors that may contribute to policy determination in a school district. The PF_n elements represent the perceptions of these factors held by district members concerned with policy. Understanding we defined as the extent to which district members perceived these factors the same way. And, as noted above, we used success of financial elections as a criterion of policy determination (i.e., school-community relations).

---

[1] Richard F. Carter and John Sutthoff, Communities and Their Schools, School of Education, Stanford University, 1960.

As we used the concept of understanding, it applies only to the common perception of what the situation is -- not what it ought to be. It is something less than total agreement. Used in this way, the concept clearly relates to communication effectiveness in the district for the sharing of perceptions, and not to the effectiveness of communication as a means of securing favorable results.

We measured understanding independently of election results. Then when we related understanding to success records, we had some confidence in the result: School districts with longer records of continuous success had better scores on our index of understanding.

To measure understanding, we had to develop an exhaustive list of the factors in school-community relations that were at least potentially contributors to policy determination. With these collected we could then construct an inventory to which district leaders could respond with their perceptions of the relative impact of each factor. The congruence of these perceptions was our measure of the concept of understanding.

Collecting the potential factors was itself a difficult task. We could expect different factors to emerge in districts of varying characteristics. So we purposively sampled many different districts using these criteria for selection: geographic location, economic capability, degree of urbanization, type of school (e.g., elementary, high school, unified), and financial support pattern.

We sent trained interviewers to these districts to search out potential factors. Using the focused interview technique, they proved for factors seen by two or more informed observers in the district to be related to the outcome of financial elections. Specific probes were used in 15 areas, set out from an examination of the literature.[2]

The 15 areas probed were:

1. School-community relations: elections;
2. School-community relations: non-elections;
3. Mediating agencies: school board;
4. Mediating agencies: mass media;
5. Mediating agencies: volunteer organizations;
6. School characteristics: personnel;
7. School characteristics: students;
8. School characteristics: educational officials (nonlocal);
9. School characteristics: procedural;
10. School characteristics: administrative attributes;
11. Community characteristics;
12. Community voter characteristics;
13. School originated communications;
14. Community originated communications; and,
15. Communications from mediating agencies.

The results of interviewing in 71 districts were some 162 factors seen as helping or hurting school-community relations in one or more districts. An inventory based on these findings was sent to a national probability sample of districts, for response by the superintendent of the district, the board president, a mass media spokesman, an active supporter of local schools, and an active opponent.

Their responses were their perceptions of how each of these factors entered into local school-community relations -- if at all. Thus we had, in addition to the data for analyzing similarity of perceptions, estimates of the impact of each factor over all districts.

---

[2] Four references that were helpful in covering the scope of school-community relations are: Leon Ovsiew, Emerging Practices in School Administration, New York: Metropolitan School Study Council and Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, 1953; Truman M. Pierce, Edward C. Merrill, Jr., Craig Wilson, and Ralph B. Kimbrough, Community Leadership for Public Education, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955; John A. Ramseyer, Lewis A. Harris, Millard Z. Pond, and Howard Wakefield, Factors Affecting Educational Administration, Ohio State University, 1955; and, Hollis A. Moore, Jr., Studies in School Administration, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C., 1957.

Our summary analysis for all districts showed that the estimates of factor impact tended to be either positive or negative. A factor perceived to be a positive force in one district would also be seen as a positive force in other districts. Similarly, a factor seen to be a negative force in one district was rarely perceived to be a positive force in another district.

Taken at face value, these results suggest a kind of "balancing" of positive forces against negative forces in school-community relations. As such, the results support a simple interpretation of the process of school-community relations, one that views the process as a continuing problem of maintaining a favorable balance.[3]

Two major shortcomings can be found in this first study. First, the conceptualization was elementary. This leads to several faults -- for instance, using election success as the only criterion of school-community relations, and thus predisposing a view of factors as either positive or negative forces but not both. Second, the factors were given subjective estimates of impact by observers. A preferable procedure is to obtain objective estimates of the factor's presence in districts, then to relate these estimates to independent estimates of the state of school-community relations.[4]

This second study was designed to correct these shortcomings. The first improvement came in the conceptualization. We worked on both the criterion variable problem and the delineation of potential factors.

---

[3] This interpretation, and the results supporting it, are reported in detail in Chapter 2 of Communities and Their Schools (see footnote 1).

[4] A preliminary study of the feasibility of obtaining objective estimates of several potential factors was conducted in the first phase of the research (reported in Chapter 6 of Communities and Their Schools). We are able to show a significant relationship between 1950 census estimates of economic capability and community growth and 1950 financial election results in California communities.

Although it is of some practical significance to view success in financial elections as an indicator -- or criterion -- of school-community relations, there is a danger in taking only this view. A factor may have some impact on school-community relations that is all for the good -- or bad -- but the impact may not be visible if we use only this one criterion.

The role we assigned the concept of understanding in our first study is a good example of this incomplete view. We saw the concept as a potential factor in achieving success. But it is also a prime candidate for becoming a criterion variable itself. In a democratic society, the attainment of understanding is an end to be desired regardless of consequent election results.

Many potential factors that comprise the areas of communication techniques might well have an impact on understanding, but not on acquiescence.[5] They should not be discarded for lacking relation with the latter.

Similarly, the concept of participation is important in a democratic society. It too may be a desirable end in and of itself.

So we have come in this second study to use all three of these concepts as criteria of school-community relations. We have observed the relationships between these criteria and the potential factors to see what should be retained as part of the structure of school-community relations.

We have also introduced a fourth criterion, the concept of quiescence. We use this concept in the sense of noncontroversy or lack of conflict. Again, this concept may be an end in itself as well as a potential factor in affecting acquiescence -- or understanding, or participation.

The concept of quiescence has another important role. It protects us from inferring too much about the state of understanding in a district. If district leaders see the situation the same way, but many aspects of the situation as placid, we could infer that a high degree of understanding exists when in fact there is only a high degree of quiescence. Effective communication would not have been necessary in this case to achieve congruence of perceptions.

---

[5] In our reconceptualization, we used a new criterion of financial election success, the concept of acquiescence.

In Part I, we use these four concepts as criteria for including potential factors in the structure of school-community relations. In Part II, we view these concepts as essential elements in the process of school-community relations. There, the relationships among the concepts are examined.

The definitions we used for these four criterion variables are as follows:

Acquiescence: the percentage of voters in district school financial elections who vote "yes" on the issue. The percentage is adjusted according to the kind of financial election held -- bond, tax, or budget. An adjustment in local district results was made according to the national average for a given kind of election. For example, budget elections usually have a higher proportion of "yes" voters than bond or tax elections. Districts holding only budget elections would be adjusted downward on this criterion.

Participation: the percentage of eligible voters in a school district who turn out to vote in school elections of all kinds. This percentage too is adjusted according to the national average for a given kind of election. In this case, for example, budget election participation would be adjusted upward, because there is less turnout for such elections than for, say, school board or financial elections.

Understanding: the degree to which informed observers in a district perceive aspects of the school-community relationship in the same way. Ten persons who hold key roles in school affairs were questioned in each district; they are: superintendent, board president, four other board members, teacher representative, parent representative, mass media representative, and an interested citizen.[6] The extent to which they commonly perceive the positive or negative impact of local factors is obtained by averaging over all possible pairs of informed observers (a maximum of 45 pairs if all ten responded to the questionnaire).

Quiescence: the degree to which informed observers in a district jointly perceive potentially important aspects of the school-community relationship to be dormant, not entering into the relationship. The extent to which they jointly perceive a lack of impact among local factors is obtained by averaging over all possible pairs of informed observers.

We also reconceptualized the listing of potential factors. Starting with the 162 factors from the previous study, we went back to the literature to see what had been developed, or could be developed, as objective estimates of these factors. It took us a year of weekly staff meetings to thrash out this problem, all the while consulting the literature and colleagues.

Very quickly we found that each factor had several possible ways of being assessed objectively. For example we could find out something about Student Pride in Schools by ascertaining student contributions of labor or gifts to the school, or by inference from the lack of damage inflicted on buildings and grounds. And this was one of the simpler factors. In some instances, we could find 40 to 50 possible measures -- e.g., Educational Characteristics of the district population, as described in the census data.

The first result of this reconceptualization was the resorting of potential factors. Each previous factor -- and several new ones -- became Areas, within which possible objective assessments were designated Variables. We then had 169 areas and over a thousand variables.

---

[6] Where possible, we selected an interested citizen who held a critical view of the local schools. We also asked for elected teacher and parent representatives.

We had increased the number of potential factors to examine about six-fold. We had also introduced another problem, that of examining variables within areas, or groups of areas, to see if variables in a given set were tapping the same factor in school-community relations. We used the analytical technique of factor analysis to cope with this latter problem, and the results of our analysis are given in Part I.

But before we started collecting data on these variables, we wanted to do some pruning. In our staff meetings, we adopted four criteria for this purpose: observability of the variable, previous use in educational research, importance accorded the variable in the educational literature (not the whole area), and reported experiences of administrators regarding the variable.

At this point we brought together an advisory group of educational leaders to review our conceptualization, and to discuss the procedures to be used in collecting the data.[7] What follows is a brief description of the procedures used. We can not possibly describe the many alterations in conceptualization that resulted.

Our next step was to sort out the variables according to the optimum source of information for each variable. Census data and school records took care of many. But we found it necessary to consider questioning individuals in school districts who held key roles in school-community relations. These persons were the only source possible for some variables. For example, only an informed observer could report on the tact displayed by board members in their relations with the public. And other information could be more efficiently gathered by personal interview (given that an interview had to be conducted anyway with certain persons). For instance, we could question board members directly about their own background in education rather than asking for the information from the school administration.

---

[7] These leaders are identified in the Preface of this report.

We then constructed specific data gathering instruments for each source of information. Each instrument was pretested in three districts where we would not be conducting the study. In Part I the source for each datum is given by reference to the instrument used.

The instruments we used were:

Questionnaires -- separate sets of questions for the district superintendent, the board president, board members, a teacher representative, a parent representative, a mass media representative, and an interested citizen.

An Inventory -- a listing of the 169 areas to which each of the ten informants named above responded with perceptions of whether the area had an impact on local school-community relations, and whether the impact was judged favorable or unfavorable.

Factual questionnaires -- two sets of questions sent to the district administration for information that would be available in the school records.[8]

Copies of these instruments are in Part I, Appendix A.

Some information not furnished from school records was obtained for us by national research agencies who sent local representatives to alternative sources. Mostly this was information on election results, essential to our measures of acquiescence and participation.

The pretesting of procedures for abstracting information from census sources made it clear that we had to develop bases for estimating district data when, as often occurred, the district was not coterminous with a census unit. The estimation procedures are reported in Part I, Appendix B.

---

[8] That is, if it were available at all. Many districts, although willing to cooperate, could not furnish all the information requested.

Our earlier study had been designed to encompass school-community relations, to explore and define its boundaries. There we used a purposive sample of school districts. In this study we wanted to draw inferences concerning the impact of each potential factor (i.e., variable). So we used a probability sample of school districts.

The Bureau of the Census drew a sample of 180 districts from its records on U. S. school districts with 150 pupils or more. Thus the sample, as selected, was representative of districts in which about 97% of the pupils were enrolled in 1960.

School districts were randomly selected, but with probability of selection proportional to pupil enrollment. In this sense, then, the sample was more representative of the conditions under which pupils receive their education than it was of conditions in the average school district. All the very large districts were included by this procedure. And relatively few very small districts were included.

Before the study was well underway, three coterminous units in the sample combined themselves into a unified district, leaving us with a final sample of 178 districts for 1960 data. The districts included in the sample are given in Table B, Part I, Appendix B.

In the summer of 1961, we began codifying data from census reports -- the 1940 and 1950 reports to establish trend variables, and the preliminary reports of 1960 characteristics. In early 1962, we began collecting data from the school districts with the first factual questionnaire. The first questionnaire was also used to obtain names and addresses for the nine persons in the district (beside the superintendent) who were to be interviewed as informed observers.

The personal interviewing of informed observers began in the spring of 1962. Staff members and professional interviewers for several national research agencies conducted the interviews, using the questionnaires developed. At the close of each personal interview, the interviewer left a copy of the inventory with the informant, to be completed and then mailed directly back to us.

The second factual questionnaire went to school districts in the late spring of 1962.

Throughout 1962 and into the early months of 1963, additional efforts were made to obtain missing data.

In requesting current information about districts, we asked for data on the 1961-62 school year. However, some information was requested for 1940, 1950, and 1960 -- and October 31 stipulated as the reporting date when the figures might vary within the year (as, for example, with pupil enrollment). Election data were requested for the period between January 1, 1948 and December 31, 1961.

From the census data, we were able to secure information for all of the 180 districts on certain district characteristics. We also obtained all the available data on elections for every district. But here we sometimes had to get the data from nonschool sources, because we did encounter districts that would not participate in the study.

The number of districts varies for the data available on other variables. Our best record for the other variables was 154 districts responding. For some variables, the total fell as low as five or ten districts -- usually because records were not kept on the given variable. But the latter were rare instances. In Part I, the number of responding districts is recorded for each variable.

Beginning in 1962, we codified the data for use in punched cards. At the same time we began a scaling analysis of certain sets of items that had been designed as assessment indexes. We analyzed these sets to see if the responses were homogeneous -- and thereby capable of being represented as a composite variable.

By the summer of 1963, we were able to begin the structural analysis. We had two objectives: describing the relationships between variables (potential factors) and our criteria of school-community relations, and, describing the relationships among groups of variables.

The earlier study used only the criterion of acquiescence and the relationships were assessed by informed observers, rather than by statistical test of the relationship between independently observed variables. In Part I, we report the results of the statistical tests conducted in this study.

In the earlier study, we made no attempt to categorize variables according to empirical relationships. We simply grouped them as we saw them. In this study, using factor analytic techniques, we were able to regroup them by their empirical relationships. As noted before, these results are also given in Part I.

The purpose of this structural analysis was to afford better knowledge of the factors in school-community relations. But we have also used the results of the analysis to guide our subsequent analysis of the process.

In Part II, where we report the results of the process analysis, we have retained those variables that have a significant relationship to at least one of the criterion variables -- acquiescence, participation, understanding, and quiescence.

Further, where factor analysis showed two or more variables to be measuring the same dimension, we retained only one variable for the process analysis.

One variable was retained for the process analysis even though it did not show a significant relationship with any criterion variable. We retained a measure of district size because it aids us in locating the districts in which the more important process variables occur.

The analysis of process took a number of forms. We began by observing the relationships among the criterion variables. Then we observed the relationships among variables that related significantly to each of the criterion variables. For instance, we wanted to see the relationships among variables that related to acquiescence.

Then we looked at a relatively small set of variables that, together with the criterion variables, seemed to promise us the best picture of the process.

Finally, we have compared our objective results on the impact of potential factors with the subjective estimates of impact made by informed observers in the sample of districts.

Part II contains the results of these analyses, along with a discussion of the inferences that we drew about the process of school-community relations.

Introduction to Part I

Some of what follows in Part I is only a prelude to the analysis reported in Part II. What we did in studying process was necessarily based on the preliminary work in studying structure. But we were interested in structural aspects also. So the content of Part I reflects this dual concern, with the scope of school-community relations to be seen on the one hand and to be pared down on the other.

Part I contains information on each of 860 variables -- taken alone and in relation to each of our four criterion variables. It concludes with a summary of criterion variable relationships for those variables carried over into the analysis of process. It also has in the appendices the instruments, estimation procedures, and sample we used.

The 860 variables are grouped in 26 divisions. These divisions constitute sets of variables within which we wanted to study the relationships among the variables, as well as the criterion variable relationships. The divisions vary in size from five to 270 variables (XXVI:Information and XV:Community Characteristics, respectively. The latter is broken down into subdivisions.)

Within each division are six sections:

A. Variables -- a listing of variables, numbered for identification within the division, with data specification and source of information.

B. Data -- a listing of variable statistics -- sample size, central tendency, variance, and correlations with criterion variables.

C. Factor analysis -- a tabulation of variable loadings on the factors derived from the intercorrelations among the variables.

D. Variables retained -- a listing of the variables in the division that were kept for the process analysis, based on the presence of significant correlation with a criterion variable and the results of the factor analysis.

E. Questions raised by the factor analysis results -- for each division (except XV:Community Characteristics), the factor analysis results were examined for relationships among variables that might be explored in future work by educational researchers.

F. Bibliography -- the references we found useful in conceptualizing variables within the division. Several publications (e.g., census references) were data sources as well.

The procedures we followed under these six headings are given in detail in the sections that follow. This introduction concludes with a brief discussion of the uses to which this Part I data may be put.

A. Variables

Each variable has been assigned a number for identification within the division. For example, I:1 is Superintendent's age. This number is used uniformly throughout both Part I and Part II.

The title of the variable (e.g., Superintendent's age) may not remain constant throughout. When divorced from its division context later in the analysis, additional information may be added to the title. For example, PFI is used as an abbreviation for Per Family Income (XV:21) in the context of Division XV, but not in the later analyses.

The order in which variables appear within divisions is not always in logical sequence. For example, XI:32 "should" precede XI:1. These anomalies resulted from analysis procedures. Generally, a logical sequence prevails.

Some variables are listed in more than one division. In these cases, the variables were to be included in factor analyses of both divisions. When they appear for the second time, they are cross-referenced to first division in which they are listed. Only factor analysis information is to be found in the second division. The Part I summary will identify them only by the first listing.

The source of information on each variable is given with the listing. The following abbreviations are used.

S = superintendent questionnaire
BP = board president questionnaire
B = board member questionnaire
T = teacher representative questionnaire
P = parent representative questionnaire
M = mass media representative questionnaire
O = interested citizen questionnaire
1F = factual questionnaire #1
2F = factual questionnaire #2
I = inventory
C = census data
SM = Sales Management data

These designations, along with the question number, are given in parentheses following the title. Questionnaire citations without question numbers refer to the face sheet of the instrument.

The title itself may suffice to specify the data collected to measure the variable (e.g., _Superintendent's age_). When questions were used to elicit information, they are reported.

Questions were used to obtain two kinds of data: information of record (e.g., I:9, _No. of elected professional offices_) and assessments (e.g., I:28, _Administrator-parent relations_).

Where assessments were required, the informed observer was furnished with a _Response Category Sheet_ from which to select the response he felt appropriate. Examples of these are to be found in Appendix A after each questionnaire.

Some assessments were expected to be more perception than reality (e.g., different views of administrator-parent relations by the superintendent and parent), so double assessments were made. The correlations between such assessments are reported.

For both assessments and information of record, sets of responses were often analyzed by scaling techniques. This had the effect of reducing the amount of data to be processed. For assessments, it also provided an indication that the questions used were tapping the same variable.

Where scaling analyses were performed, the scale criteria are reported.[1] In addition, when responses were information of record, the proportion of school districts responding "yes" is also given for each item.

If a set of items did not meet all scale criteria, we looked at the results from removing an item from the set. Rejected assessment items were discarded. Rejected items of record were usually retained as separate variables.

Several sets of items were retained as "quasi-scales" even though failing to meet one of the scale criteria, if removal of an item did not improve the scale and if observed error was random.

The range in scores possible for a district on a scaled set of items is from zero to the number of items in the set.

Where more than one informed observer's assessment was used for a given variable (e.g., I:30, Superintendent reaction to criticism), the average scale score was used. In these cases, scale criteria were obtained from a sample of observer responses but the scores were calculated on all responses.

In Division XV (Community Characteristics), abbreviations are used freely to cut down on the space needed to report our findings. We made considerable use of ratios in this division. Our conceptualization of these areas led us to suspect several relative standings to be as important, if not more important, than the district status at a given point in time (1960). The ratios we were interested in are:

District to state ratio (D/S): For a community characteristic like Per Family Income (XV:21), the relative standing of the district within the state may be more important than its standing within the nation. This also relieved some of the problems that arise from regional differences. With only 180 districts to analyze, we could not do separate analyses for regions.

---

[1] The criteria are the coefficient of reproducibility (see: Samuel A. Stauffer, Louis Guttman, Edward A. Suchman, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Shirley A. Star, and John A. Clausen, Measurement and Prediction, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950) and the coefficients of scalability for items and individuals (see: Herbert Menzel "A New Coefficient for Scalogram Analysis," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer, 1953), pp. 268-80.)

1960 to 1950 ratio: For some community characteristics, the change in the previous decade may be more indicative of local conditions than the 1960 status (e.g., XV:196, Ratio of 1960 percent attending school to 1950 percent attending school).

1950 to 1940 ratio: In some cases, the district may have experienced a change in the immediate post-World War II period that affects school-community relations in 1960 (e.g., XV:246, Ratio of 1950 reciprocal of fertility ratio to 1940 reciprocal of fertility ratio).

Ratio of 1960/1950 ratio to 1950/1940 ratio: In a few instances, we have looked at the acceleration of change over the two decades (e.g., XV:187, Ratio of 1950-60 percent population increase to 1940-50 percent population increase).

B. Data

The variable titles are not given in this section. The number assigned in Section A is used for identification. Variables that were previously listed in another division are not reported in this section.

The number of cases, (N), on which the estimates of central tendency, variation, and correlation were based is given in the first column. The number varies primarily according to the number of districts responding to a given instrument, secondarily to the number of districts having information on the variable or to whom the question is applicable (e.g., X:12, No. of other public functions by budget reviewing agency is necessarily restricted to those districts having budget reviewing agencies).

The mean is reported in the second column. For dichotomous measures, the mean can be converted to a proportion.

In a few cases, the mean is slightly underestimated because we assigned scores of 99 to districts that reported 100 as a proportion. For example, in V:53, some districts reported 100% of their high school teachers had at least one college degree.

The median is reported in the third column. For dichotomous measures, the median is zero if the proportion is less than half and one if the proportion is more than half.

The standard deviation is reported in the fourth column.

The skewness is reported in the fifth column. Skewness exercises a limiting effect on correlation with another variable when the two are skewed in different directions. Fortunately, our four criterion variables were only slightly skewed:

Understanding: .56
Quiescence: -.20
Acquiescence: .86
Participation: -.40

Finally, the correlation of each variable is given for each of the criterion variables.

The procedures used to operationally define each of the criterion variables were as follows:

Understanding (U): The similarity between paired perceptions of two informed observers in a district was calculated as the number of instances in which they agreed that a factor was either hurting or not hurting the local school-community relationship, out of 169 possible instances. This score was derived for each possible pair of observers in the district. The average similarity score was used as the measure of understanding for the district. A number of alternative scoring procedures was assessed. The distinction in perceptions of "hurting" versus "not hurting" was the most sensitive criterion, judged by its relationships with other criterion variables.

Quiescence (Q): This was calculated as the number of instances in which two observers in a district agreed that a factor had no effect on the local school-community relationship. The score was obtained for each possible pair of observers, then averaged for the district score.

Acquiescence (A): 1960 acquiescence scores were calculated as the average proportion of those voting in school financial elections between January 1, 1959 and December 31, 1961 who voted "yes," with an adjustment in score based on the national average for each type of election (bond, tax, and budget). A 1950 acquiescence score was similarly derived.

Participation (P): 1960 participation scores were calculated in the same manner as the acquiescence scores, based on the average proportion voting of those eligible to vote in school elections (bond, tax, budget, and board). A 1950 participation score was also obtained.

The significance of the reported correlation is indicated by the use of asterisks following the correlation statistic:

* significant at the .05 level;
** significant at the .01 level; and
*** significant at the .001 level.

The level of significance is dependent on the number of districts for which data was available on both variables. This varies for both potential factor and criterion, and the level of significance was calculated for each correlation individually.

Intensive searching of local records yielded information on acquiescence from districts on 98% of the bond elections held, on 96% of the tax elections held, and on 100% of the budget elections held.

Participation information was harder to obtain. Records were available for 82% of the bond elections held, for 85% of the tax elections held, and for 69% of the budget elections held.

Some 41 districts held no financial elections at all.

A few variables are component parts of the understanding criterion (e.g., I:47, Superintendent-board understanding). These have artifactually high correlations with this criterion.

Decimal points are omitted in the reporting of correlation statistics.

C. Factor analysis

Variables included in the factor analysis are identified by the number assigned in Section A of the division. As noted earlier, some variables from previous divisions are included.

Variables listed for the division are sometimes excluded from the factor analysis. Omissions are noted. Reasons are:

1. We may have viewed individual items of a scalable set as well as the total set in Sections A and B. Only the total set is treated in the factor analysis.

2. We sometimes had two variables in Sections A and B, one of which was a necessary condition for the other. The two would necessarily be artifactually correlated. Only one was retained.

3. In a few instances, a variable had no variance. No district -- or all districts -- possessed the characteristic (e.g., III:9, Identification of gifted child).

The second column reports the communality for each variable (h^2). With low numbers of cases, this statistic is occasionally unstable. When the communality exceeded 1.00, this instability is noted.

Subsequent columns give the loadings of the variables on the factors derived from the matrix of intercorrelations. The factors are rotated, by an orthogonal method (varimax). Only loadings of ± .40 are reported.

Decimal points are omitted for both communality estimates and factor loadings.

D. Variables retained

With the exception of 1960 pupil enrollment, no variable was retained that did not have a significant correlation with at least one criterion variable.

The results of the factor analysis were examined to see if two or more variables with the same relationships to the criterion variables were related to each other (i.e., appeared on the same factor). In such cases, only one variable was retained.

The selection of which variable to retain was governed by the following criteria, in the order given:

1. The variable having the highest correlation with the criterion variable(s).
2. The variable based on the largest number of cases.
3. The variable with a loading on that factor alone.
4. The variable with the highest loading on the factor.
5. The variable with the least skewness.

Some relabeling of variables was done in this section, in anticipation of subsequent use outside the context of the division.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Although the focus of our investigation was on school-community relations, and therefore the relationships between variables and criteria of those relations, the factor analyses yield suggestive evidence of relationships among the variables within divisions.

To another investigator, one of the variables within a division might be an appropriate criterion for some important aspect of educational policy.

Without attempting to specify what alternative criteria might be considered, we have called attention in this section to variable relationships that might be of interest to future investigators.

F. Bibliography

The bibliographic entries are listed in alphabetical order. Entries represent those that were of use to us. To some extent, the number of entries indexes the amount of work that had been previously done in observing variables within each division.

Many of the decisions we made in defining and measuring variables were guided solely by the administrative experiences of study personnel.

To conclude this introduction, we shall point out several ways in which the data of this report might be put to use.

Apart from the byproducts of the factor analyses, the usefulness of these data stems primarily from the identification of what appear to be the more important factors in school-community relations. Given this characteristic, these uses seem indicated:

Diagnosis of district problems. When a general sense of "something is wrong" is established for a district, the next step demands that the difficulty be located. With so many things that could affect school-community relations, it is of considerable help to have the possibilities limited.

A district can compare its standing on the more important characteristics obtained here with the measures of central tendency given for the national sample.

Just as importantly, perhaps, the district should reconsider any concern that has been focused on a characteristic that does not appear here to be an important factor in school-community relations. It may still be concerned with the characteristic, but less for its impact on school-community relations.

Solving district problems. Having a more accurate diagnosis of district problems, some priorities can be set out for means of altering local school-community relations. These can be based on the data summarized at the end of this report.

The particular aspect of school-community relations, or aspects, can be singled out for attention. The variables in the summary are grouped according to the aspect(s) of school-community relations to which they are related, and according to whether they are positively or negatively related.

Some district characteristics are more easily changed than others. Given a particular focus of attention (e.g., on understanding), the district can elect to change those characteristics more susceptible to intervention.

The probability of securing a desired result varies with the characteristic which is to be changed. The amount of correlation with a criterion is one estimate of the better chance.

To change one characteristic may be more costly -- in time, money, or personnel -- than another. This attribute of the more important variables can also be taken into account.

Comprehending school-community relations. Although our data furnish a basis for enlightened trial and error procedures in altering school-community relations, we still lack a knowledge of how these variables fit together -- of the process of school-community relations.

In Part II, we shall report our ventures into this territory. Hopefully, others will find this first set of data a useful adjunct to their own adventures.

Part I

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Variables

1. Superintendent's age (S)
2. Years as superintendent in district (S)
3. Years as administrator in district (S)
4. Years experience as a superintendent (S)
5. Years experience as an administrator (S)
6. Years teaching in district (S)
7. Total years teaching experience (S)
8. Educational preparation, no. of degrees (S)
9. Elected professional offices, no. of (S)

   (S-1): Have you held, or do you now hold, any elected office in a professional educational organization?

10. Appointments to statewide educational groups, no. of (S-2)
11. Nonprofessional organizations (local) to which superintendent belongs, no. of (S-3)
12. Local nonprofessional organizations, no. of offices held in (S-3)
13. Other educational officials, advice and assistance sought from

    (S-4): To what extent do you go to each of the following kinds of persons for advice or assistance:

    a. county educational officials?
    b. the state department of education?
    c. college or university staff members?
    d. neighboring district officials?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .903
Scalability, items = .720
Scalability, individuals = .649

14. Other educational officials, coordination with

(S-5): To what extent do you get together with each of the following kinds of persons in order to coordinate mutual interests or activities:

a. county educational officials?
b. state department of education?
c. college or university staff members?
d. neighboring district officials?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .942
Scalability, items = .813
Scalability, individuals = .775

15. Personal goal: teaching in higher education

(S-6): In terms of your personal goals, how much do you feel each of the following is a possible direction for you to go in your career:

a. teaching in higher education?
b. administration outside education?
c. educational administration other than a superintendency?
d. superintendency in another district?

16. Personal goal: administration outside education

(S-6): See 15

17. Personal goal: educational administration other than a superintendency

(S-6): See 15

18. Personal goal: superintendency in another district

(S-6): See 15

19. Attitude toward academic freedom

(S-8): To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

a. Teachers should take loyalty oaths before being allowed to teach.
b. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions outside the classroom on any subject.
c. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions inside the classroom on any subject.
e. Any group, representing any viewpoint, should be able to use school facilities for a public meeting.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .878
Scalability, items = .668
Scalability, individuals = .512

20. Attitude toward religion and public schools

(S-8): To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

g. Schools should provide released time for pupils to have religious instruction.
h. Public funds should be used to provide transportation for parochial school pupils.
i. Religious groups should be able to use school facilities for private social purposes.
j. Federal aid should be given parochial schools to help support the secular parts of their programs.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .923
Scalability, items = .787
Scalability, individuals = .627

21. Communication with power structure

(S-9): When a problem in district policy arises, to what extent are you likely to talk over the situation with each of the following:

a. local business leaders?
b. local professional leaders?
c. local civic club leaders?
d. local civic officials?
e. prospective opposition leaders?
f. local parent group leaders?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .915
Scalability, items = .755
Scalability, individuals = .660

22. Agreement with power structure

(S-10): With each of these types of persons, to what extent are you usually able to reach a satisfactory agreement:

a. local business leaders?
b. local professional leaders?
c. local civic club leaders?
d. local civic officials?
f. local parent group leaders?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .964
Scalability, items = .856
Scalability, individuals = .859

23. Apprehension of power structure

(S-11): Of the following types of persons -- local business leaders, professional leaders, civic club leaders, civic officials, prospective opposition leaders, local parent group leaders -- are there any you would not care to go against if they opposed a proposed district policy?
(Code: no. of types mentioned)

24. Social contacts with power structure

(S-12): Outside the performance of your duties, to what extent do you associate with each of the following types of persons:

a. persons recognized as the local social leaders?
b. persons recognized locally as politically powerful?
c. persons of personal wealth locally?
d. persons heading large local businesses?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .975
Scalability, items = .907
Scalability, individuals = .903

25. Homogeneity of power structure

(S-13): To what extent do the same persons constitute these four groups (see 24 above) in your district?

26. Orientation of maintenance staff to policy

(S-37): Are new maintenance staff members oriented to major school policies? In what way?

(Code: 0--none
1--group meeting or session
2--individually
3--other)

27. Maintenance staff, inclusion in decision making

(S-39): Are members of the maintenance staff represented formally in any of these ways:

a. on an advisory committee of the school board? (13% yes)
b. on an administrative council? (25% yes)
c. at board meetings? (28% yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .940
Scalability, items = .712
Scalability, individuals = .487

28. Administrator-parent relations (see also 32)

(S-84): How good is the relationship between local parent groups and district officials?

29. Implementation of board decisions: superintendent reaction to accomplished change

(BP-44 and B-7): When the board finally adopts a proposal with which the superintendent has been in disagreement, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. accept and implement it without question?
b. drag his feet?
c. try to find new flaws in the proposal?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .927
Scalability, items = .744
Scalability, individuals = .735

Average score used (all board members)

30. Superintendent reaction to criticism

(BP-42 and B-5): When the superintendent is criticized by someone in the audience at a board meeting, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. show a sense of humor?
b. become irritated?
c. try to postpone the subject until a later time?
d. shift the blame if he can?
e. accept the criticism, even if it seems unwarranted?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .896
Scalability, items = .683
Scalability, individuals = .617

31. Superintendent reaction to proposed change

(BP-43 and B-6): When the superintendent finds himself in disagreement with a proposal from the board, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. try to find flaws in the proposal?
b. try to postpone any decision for more evidence?
c. bring pressures to bear on the board?
d. accept the proposal without resistence?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .927
Scalability, items = .744
Scalability, individuals = .735
Average score used (all board members)

32. Administrator-parent relations

(P-4): See 28

The correlation between S and P assessments (variables 28 and 32) is .15.

33. Superintendent reaction to parents

(P-6): How would you rate your superintendent's reactions to parents who want to talk to him?

34. Accessibility of teaching staff

(P-7): How would you rate your average teacher's reactions to parents who want to talk about your children's problems?

35. Superintendent as a public speaker (see also 40)

(BP-41a): How would you evaluate your superintendent as a public speaker?

36. Superintendent's personal appearance (see also 41)

(BP-41b): How would you evaluate your superintendent's personal appearance?

37. Administrator-teacher relations (morale)

(BP-41j): How would you evaluate your superintendent in considering staff morale?

38. Board referral of citizen proposals to the superintendent

(BP-45a): If the board receives from a citizen's group a proposal for a change in district policy, to what extent is the board likely to refer it to the superintendent for recommendation?

39. Teacher support of the administration, no. of instances

(T-23): What support have teachers, as a group, given school leadership during controversy or crisis?

40. Superintendent as a public speaker

(T-24a): see 35

BP and T assessments (variables 35 and 40) correlate .23.

41. Superintendent's personal appearance

(T-24b): See 36

BP and T assessments (variables 36 and 41) correlate .38.

42. Administrator-teacher relations: morale (See also 55)

(T-24): How would you evaluate your superintendent on each of the following characteristics:

j. in considering teacher morale?
k. in putting teacher suggestions to use?
l. in allowing teachers sufficient freedom in procedures?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .970
Scalability, items = .918
Scalability, individuals = .812

43. Superintendent reaction to criticism (relevant to staff)

(T-25): To what extent do you feel that the superintendent tends to take it out on the staff when the schools are criticized?

44. Administrator-teacher relations (general)

(T-26): How would you characterize the relationship in this district between administration and teaching staff?

45. Delegation of administrative authority to teachers

(2F-63): To whom are custodians directly responsible?

(Code: 0--other
1--to principal or vice principal
2--to head custodian
3--to teacher)

46. Board reaction to proposed changes from the superintendent

(S-66): When you, as superintendent, put a major proposal before the board of control, to what extent is the district board likely to respond in each of these ways:

a. refer to a board advisory committee for recommendation?
b. hold a special public meeting to discuss it?
c. discuss it with civic leaders?
d. make an immediate decision?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .908
Scalability, items = .750
Scalability, individuals = .651

47. Superintendent-board understanding

(I): The average number of agreements between superintendent and board members on how factors affect district.

48. Educational goals: prepare children for problems of adult life

(S-7): Assuming that the following purposes are goals of most schools, how would you rank then in importance?

a. prepare children for problems of adult life?
b. prepare children for citizenship?
c. develop intellectual abilities of children?
d. give children sense of our cultural heritage?

49. Educational goals: prepare children for citizenship

(S-7): See 48

50. Educational goals: develop intellectual abilities of children

(S-7): See 48

51. Educational goals: give children sense of our cultural heritage

(S-7): See 48

52. Superintendent as a school leader

(BP-41): How would you evaluate your superintendent on each of the following characteristics:

c. in supervisory roles?
d. in initiating changes?
e. in coordination of personnel?
f. in evaluating staff performance?
g. in mediating between factions?
h. in planning ahead?
i. in analyzing problems?

The average correlation between items is .63. Average score used.

53. Superintendent as a school leader

(T-24c-i): see 52

The average correlation between items is .58. Average score used.

The correlation between BP and T assessments (variables 52 and 53) is .17.

54. Superintendent-Board educational value similarity

(S-7, B-4, BP-46): The average difference between superintendent and board rankings (score reversed)

55. Administrator-teacher relations: morale of staff

(S-43): How would you evaluate your relationship with the teaching staff on each of these factors:

a. considering teacher morale?
b. putting teacher suggestions to use?
c. allowing teachers freedom in procedures?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .940
Scalability, items = .824
Scalability, individuals = .731

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 42 and 55) is .12.

B. Data

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
1	151	51.32	52.00	7.84	-.12	-07	-13	04	-02
2	153	8.37	6.00	7.43	1.58	19*	-02	17	-11
3	149	12.30	10.00	10.12	.87	03	01	02	-10
4	152	12.65	12.00	8.92	.69	23**	-09	20	-11
5	151	20.82	19.00	10.23	.27	06	-15	01	-13
6	154	3.78	.00	6.76	2.57	-04	-07	21*	-13
7	152	9.30	7.00	8.12	1.61	-09	07	17	-07
8	151	2.29	2.00	.64	1.20	-07	-10	-15	12
9	154	1.41	1.00	1.59	1.65	-09	-10	09	-02
10	154	1.38	1.00	1.48	1.79	00	-21*	-01	08
11	154	3.93	4.00	2.37	.29	03	-21**	-06	-10
12	154	2.49	2.00	2.18	.88	03	-28***	-05	04
13	151	1.91	2.00	1.17	.17	-01	-13	11	05
14	152	2.24	2.00	1.14	-.27	-06	-21**	07	-01
15	150	2.32	2.00	1.34	.57	-05	-08	06	19
16	150	1.96	2.00	1.15	1.11	01	04	25*	15
17	152	2.44	2.00	1.23	.37	08	06	12	01
18	150	2.61	2.00	1.43	.33	13	04	-04	20
19	154	2.04	2.00	1.11	.00	-12	12	07	06
20	154	1.53	1.00	1.25	.52	-18*	06	-06	15
21	153	3.07	3.00	1.91	-.03	-03	-18*	18	-28**
22	147	2.44	2.00	1.36	.15	17*	-12	36***	-29**
23	148	.74	.00	1.45	2.42	07	-03	-19	07
24	150	1.94	2.00	1.20	.04	-02	-07	22*	-28**
25	141	3.09	3.00	.94	-.24	-01	-02	-12	-05

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
26	148	1.64	1.50	1.08	-.03	-02	11	-05	16
27	153	.69	.00	.90	1.19	-14	-14	-05	-02
28	151	4.64	5.00	.58	-1.39	26**	03	07	-15
29	153	1.90	2.00	.61	-.23	29***	-17*	08	-01
30	153	2.32	2.40	.80	-.11	42***	-10	06	-17
31	153	2.24	2.30	.71	-.20	35***	07	26*	-19
32	153	4.35	5.00	.11	-1.70	24**	08	07	-08
33	153	4.71	5.00	.81	-3.21	18*	07	16	-15
34	153	4.47	5.00	.81	-1.72	06	12	17	-04
35	153	3.87	4.00	1.00	-.75	21**	-13	-04	-08
36	153	4.52	5.00	.80	-2.14	17*	-12	-18	00
37	153	4.29	5.00	1.04	-1.71	42***	00	00	-10
38	153	4.13	5.00	1.16	-1.42	01	-10	-04	-01
39	115	.69	.00	.83	1.10	-14	-19*	01	05
40	153	3.93	4.00	.94	-.48	20*	-06	-08	-03
41	153	4.63	5.00	.62	-1.65	11	-05	-01	-02
42	153	1.51	1.00	1.13	.02	13	02	04	-12
43	153	1.51	1.00	.87	2.01	-12	06	-01	14
44	151	4.07	4.00	1.02	-.83	23**	02	09	-15
45	120	1.16	1.00	.53	.13	-16	15	-13	11
46	144	2.17	2.00	1.20	-.18	-04	02	00	02
47	125	.16	.15	.09	1.86	80***	18*	27*	-10
48	146	2.31	2.00	1.16	.22	-03	-04	08	04
49	147	2.10	2.00	.94	.36	-06	05	-25*	09
50	147	2.05	2.00	.86	.21	03	-09	17	00

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
51	146	3.47	4.00	.85	-1.53	04	06	-08	-19
52	153	4.22	4.50	.88	-1.73	38***	-15	-04	-14
53	153	4.25	4.42	.73	-1.10	17*	-09	08	-10
54	142	10.31	8.70	7.80	-1.53	04	07	-01	-10
55	154	1.62	2.00	.99	-.02	07	04	.34***	-.32**

C. Factor analysis

		Factors																	
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	81				78														
4	73				78														
5	81				83														
7	72									80									
8	52																		
9	57		56																
10	66		53																
11	76		75																
12	77		81																
13	71						75												
14	73						77												
15	62										43					41			
16	69										73								
17	69										74								
18	67										51								
19	71															77			
20	50														56				
21	66						61												
22	58												42						
23	62														74				
24	68													48					
25	81													88					
26	49											64							
27	67												71						
28	71										46						45		

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
29	74							78											
30	77							79											
31	79							80											
32	67								57										
33	73								77										
34	59								68										
35	70	76																	
36	72	71																	
37	75	65																	
38	58																46		
39	63		45																
40	66			59															
41	66			55															
42	72			78															
43	67			-77															
44	75			76															
45	75																		83
46	77																-80		
47	74							54											
48	88					-53						53						-43	
49	84																	86	
50	74											-67							
51	88					89													
52	79	77																	
53	82			84															
54	83					86													

Variables 2, 3, and 6 were not included in the factor analysis. They are components of variables 4, 5, and 7, respectively. Variable 55 was inadvertently omitted. It is included in the factor analysis for Division V.

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 contains the board president evaluations of the superintendent. Significant correlations are found only with the criterion of understanding. We retained variable 52, Superintendent as a school leader (BP).

Factor 2 contains variables representing the superintendent's affiliations with professional and local nonprofessional organizations, along with staff support for him during controversy. We found significant correlations with quiescence only. We retained variable 12, No. of offices held by superintendent in local, nonprofessional organizations.

Factor 3 contains the teacher evaluations of the superintendent. We found significant correlations with understanding only. We retained variable 53, Superintendent as a school leader (T).

Factor 4 contains variables of administrative experience (with age included as an artifact). We found one significant correlation with understanding only. We retained variable 4, No. of years experience as a superintendent.

Factor 5 contains variables describing educational goals, focusing on the similarity of goals between superintendent and board members. Lacking significant correlation, none of these variables was retained.

Factor 6 contains measures of contact with other educational officials and communication with the local power structure. There are significant correlations with quiescence and with participation -- the latter only for communication with the power structure. We retained variable 14, Coordination with other educational officials and variable 21, Communication with power structure.

Factor 7 contains the board members' evaluations of the superintendent's reactions in several situations, along with the degree of understanding between superintendent and board. Each of four variables has a different pattern of relationships with the criterion variables, so we retained all four:

variable 29, *Implementation of board decisions: superintendent reaction to accomplished change*; variable 30, *Superintendent reaction to criticism*; variable 31, *Superintendent reaction to proposed change*; and, variable 47, *Superintendent-board understanding*.

Factor 8 contains the parent evaluations of relations between administration and parent groups. We found a significant correlation with understanding only. We retained variable 32, *Administrator-parent relations (P)*.

Factor 9 focuses on only one variable, that of general teaching experience. It has no significant correlation with any criterion variable. However, teaching experience in the district does have a significant correlation with acquiescence. We omitted it from the factor analysis because it would necessarily be correlated to general teaching experience (part-whole relationship). We retained variable 6, *No. of years superintendent taught in district*.

Factor 10 contains aspirations of the superintendent to follow each of four possible paths. Surprisingly, all are intercorrelated. Conceivably, aspirations in one direction would have negated those in another direction. We found a significant correlation only for one of these variables, and only with acquiescence. We retained variable 16, *Superintendent's personal goal: administration outside education*.

The remaining factors were not helpful in reducing the number of variables retained. They consist of one, two, or three variables -- often in inexplicable relationships (e.g., factor 12 has agreement with the power structure together with inclusion of the maintenance staff in policy making).

We had only six variables left having significant correlation with one or more criterion variables. We retained these: variable 20, *Superintendent's attitude toward religion and public schools*; variable 22, *Agreement with power structure*; variable 24, *Superintendent's social contacts with power structure*; variable 28, *Administrator-parent relations (S)*;

variable 49, Superintendent's educational goal: prepare children for citizenship; and, variable 55, Administrator-teacher relations: staff morale (S).

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 2: Are the superintendent's affiliations with local groups the result of controversy?

Factor 6: Does communication with local power structure and with other educational officials represent something more than a tendency for some superintendents to get around more than others?

Factor 7: Do superintendents who are more open in their reactions have a better chance to communicate effectively with their school boards? (This question has been further researched by Olson, who concludes that this is indeed the case. See: Richard F. Olson, Factors Affecting Understanding Between Superintendents and School Boards, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1965.)

Factor 14: Are superintendents who have liberal attitudes toward the relationship of public schools and religion apprehensive of the local power structure?

Factor 15: Why do superintendents looking forward to getting into higher education have liberal attitudes toward academic freedom?

F. Bibliography

American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendency. 30th Yearbook, Washington, D. C. 1952.

American Association of School Administrators. School Board-Superintendent Relationships. 34th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1956.

American Association of School Administrators & National School Boards Association. On Selecting A Superintendent of Schools. Washington, D. C., 1962.

American Association of School Administrators & Research Division of the National Education Association. Profile of the School Superintendent. Washington, D. C., 1960.

Administrative Behavior in Education. (ed. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg) New York: Harper, 1957.

Campbell, Roald F. and Faber, Charles F. "Administrative Behavior: Theory and Research," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 31, No. 4 (October, 1961).

Carlson, Richard O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1962.

Chase, Francis S. and Guba, Egon G. "Administrative Roles And Behavior." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 25, No. 4 (October, 1955).

Further Studies In Attitudes. (ed. H. H. Remmers) series 18, Purdue University: The Division of Educational Reference, Studies in Higher Education, Series No. 18, 1950.

Gillet, M. M. "Teacher Looks at the School Executives." Journal of Education, Vol. 128 (April, 1945).

Halpin, Andrew W. The leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956.

Mandell, M. M. "Testing for Administrative and Supervisory Positions." Education and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 5 (1945).

Manson, G. E. and Freeman, G. L. "Technique for Evaluating Assembled Evidence of Potential Leadership Ability." Education and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 4 (1944).

Moore, Hollis A., Jr. "Signs of Success in School Administration," The Nation's Schools, Vol. 52, No. 1 (July, 1953).

Nimnicht, Glendon Perrin. A Study of Successful Superintendents And Their Leadership Ability. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1958.

Savage, William W. and Beem, Harlan D. "The Effective Administrator", Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 11, No. 2 (October, 1953).

Sletten, Vernon O. _A Related Study of the Opinions of Montana School Board Members and Superintendents on Selected Board Policy Practices_. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1954.

Wilson, Robert E. _The Modern School Superintendent_. New York: Harper, 1960.

II. STUDENTS

A. Variables

1. Social clubs, invitational

(S-16): Is the membership in social clubs solely by invitation?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

2. Social club goals vs. educational goals

(S-17): To what extent do you feel that the goals of the local student social clubs are inconsistent with those of the educator?

3. Planning student programs

(S-20): As far as planning goes, to what extent are your pupils involved in each of the following:

a. dramatic presentations by pupils?
b. debates and forums including pupils?
c. rallies and pep meetings?
d. outside speakers?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .905
Scalability, items = .750
Scalability, individuals = .596

4. Participation in student programs

(S-21): To what extent do your pupils participate in each of these:

a. dramatic presentations?
b. musical presentations?
c. debates and forums?
d. exhibits and demonstrations?
e. rallies and pep meetings?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .924
Scalability, items = .747
Scalability, individuals = .617

5. Student newspaper: curricular or extracurricular

   (S-22): Is there a student newspaper published in the district? Is it published as a class exercise or extracurricular activity?

   (Code: 0--no newspaper
   1--class exercise
   2--extracurricular)

6. Participation in local non-school events, no. of instances

   (S-24): What local non-school events do district pupils participate in as representatives of the schools?

7. Policy on non-participation, no. of local events pupils barred from

   (S-25): In what kinds of contests or other events does the district not allow school representation by its pupils?

8. Discipline, district policy on corporal punishment

   (S-26): What is the district policy on corporal punishment?

   (Code: 0--no policy
   1--not permitted or used
   2--principal or other administrator involved
   3--parents involved
   4--other)

9. Discipline, student participation in

   (S-27): In what ways do pupils participate in determining punishments?

   (Code: 0--none
   1--student government involved
   2--other)

10. Athletics, community reaction

    (S-29): When your athletic teams have a losing season, to what extent can you expect criticism from local citizens?

11. Social clubs

    (S-15): Do you have any student clubs whose purposes are primarily social?

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

12. Student conduct in the classroom (see also 30)

    (T-29): How much of a problem is pupil conduct in the classroom for your district?

13. Student conduct outside the classroom (see also 31)

    (T-30): How much of a problem is pupil conduct outside the classroom for your district?

14. Student conduct, number of problems (see also 32)

    (T-31): Are there any specific conduct problems, in or out of school, that have come to your attention recently?

15. Athletic events scheduled during school hours, number of (2b-56)

16. Athletic events scheduled weekdays after school, number of (2b-56)

17. Athletic events scheduled weekday nights, number of (2b-56)

18. Athletic events on Saturday (day), number of (2b-56)

19. Athletic events on Saturday nights, number of (2b-56)

20. National Merit Test semifinalists, percent of (2b-22)

21. Student percentile rank on national spelling test, elementary (2b-23)

22. Student percentile rank on national reading test, elementary (2b-23)

23. Student percentile rank on national arithmetic test, elementary (2b-23)

24. Student percentile rank on national mathematics test, secondary (2b-23)

25. Student percentile rank on national science test, secondary (2b-23)

26. Student percentile rank on national language test, secondary (2b-23)

(*)

27. Eighth graders entering ninth grade, percent of (2F-24)

28. Seniors going to college, percent of (2F-25,19)

29. National Merit Test participants, percent of (2F-21)

30. Student conduct in the classroom

    (P-15): See 12

    The correlation between T and P assessments (variables 12 and 30) is .16.

31. Student conduct outside the classroom

    (P-16): See 13

    The correlation between T and P assessments (variables 13 and 31) is .21.

32. Student conduct, number of problems

    (P-17): See 14

    The correlation between T and P assessments (variables 14 and 32) is .26.

33. Dropouts, lack of high school

    (2F-19, 17): The number of 1961 public high school graduates divided by one-fourth of the total high school enrollment for 1961.

34. Students in honor society, percent of (2F-20)

35. Pupil-teacher ratio, K-6 (2F-17, 7)

36. Pupil-teacher ratio, 7-8 (2F-17, 7)

37. Pupil-teacher ratio, 9-12 (2F-17, 7)

---

* Because of insufficient N's the following variables were eliminated: student percentile rank for state spelling, reading, and arithmetic tests on the elementary grade level; state mathematics, language arts, and science tests on the secondary level, and pupil-teacher ratio, grades 13-14.

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	46	.41	.00	.49	.35	-11	-16	-46*	30
2	45	2.20	2.00	1.50	.64	03	-13	00	17
3	150	2.37	2.00	1.25	-.24	-02	-13	10	-02
4	152	3.07	3.00	1.40	-.38	02	-24**	-05	05
5	154	1.53	2.00	.68	-1.15	14	-06	02	08
6	153	2.80	3.00	2.07	.52	-05	-12	-13	05
7	140	.86	.00	1.12	1.41	00	-16	09	-03
8	152	2.41	2.00	1.43	-.27	-07	-04	-06	10
9	150	.75	1.00	.72	.42	-12	-17*	05	04
10	147	2.48	2.00	.97	.38	09	-08	-14	-03
11	152	.30	.00	.46	.86	-07	-13	-04	-06
12	154	2.45	2.00	.84	1.06	-25**	00	-01	00
13	153	2.52	2.00	.84	1.08	-09	-02	11	-04
14	150	1.24	1.00	1.09	.54	-14	-04	08	-16
15	115	.54	.00	1.16	2.20	05	03	12	-11
16	115	3.01	3.00	1.12	-.90	04	00	-04	-32**
17	115	1.72	2.00	1.26	.17	11	-23*	-17	02
18	115	1.11	1.00	1.23	.83	02	14	02	-10
19	115	.57	.00	.99	1.80	14	-05	-03	-12
20	80	2.68	2.00	2.24	.73	13	-17	-10	-10
21	47	63.66	60.00	15.09	.58	22	35*	-19	-05
22	52	62.31	61.00	15.72	.18	17	22	-13	-22
23	53	61.96	60.00	14.60	.46	06	20	-17	03
24	44	65.11	65.50	15.92	.15	-02	31*	-18	12
25	37	65.14	65.00	15.48	.32	05	36*	11	-05

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
26	43	60.54	60.00	14.22	.76	08	14	-14	14
27	79	95.24	98.00	9.16	-6.33	-05	-25*	-08	-02
28	84	42.70	43.00	16.22	.02	12	14	00	-06
29	81	26.25	24.00	18.87	1.48	14	-02	02	12
30	151	2.30	2.00	.91	.93	-42***	01	01	-10
31	151	2.38	2.00	.87	.82	-26**	02	08	-13
32	152	.93	1.00	1.10	-.12	-17*	-16*	-14	-12
33	98	26.25	26.35	11.56	-.44	-04	-12	12	-25*
34	66	4.62	4.00	3.50	1.61	19	05	41**	07
35	116	28.97	28.92	4.15	-.16	-04	-04	-07	12
36	116	25.62	24.47	8.73	2.25	08	-11	20	14
37	109	21.91	21.75	5.35	.46	00	-28**	-09	02

C. Factor analysis

		Factors													
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	94		92												
2	105*													79	
3	76				73										
4	71				78										
5	76							82							
6	78					41			66						
7	72								69						
8	68											65			
9	57											61			
10	70									73					
11	68													73	
12	79			86											
13	76			83											
14	53			45											
15	70				-40										
16	69														63
17	79									63					
18	72														78
19	80														72
20	84					82									
21	95	88													
22	92	89													
23	84	85													
24	92	86													
25	104*	85													

		Factors													
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
26	95	85													
27	83												84		
28	76							-48							
29	65					-71									
30	79						83								
31	81						86								
32	55						55								
33	76										81				
34	75		-56												
35	61														
36	78	-42											40		
37	69										40				

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 contains all the variables relating to student performance on national standardized tests. We found significant correlations only in relation to quiescence. However, we retained two variables with different patterns of relationship to the other criteria: variable 21, Elementary student rank on national spelling test, and, variable 25, Secondary student rank on national science test.

Factor 2 has only two variables, and they are opposites. Both have significant correlations with acquiescence, but in opposing directions. Their relationship patterns differ with the other criteria, and we kept them both: variable 1, Invitational social clubs for students, and, variable 34, Percent of students in honor society.

Factor 3 is the teacher's assessment of student conduct, in and out of the classroom. Only one variable is significantly related to a criterion -- understanding -- and we kept it: variable 12, Student misconduct in the classroom (T).

Factor 4 has two aspects of pupil participation contrasted with athletic events scheduled during school hours. We kept the one variable that is significantly related to quiescence; variable 4, Participation in student programs.

Factor 5 has student participation in local nonschool events with the number of semifinalists in the National Merit Test. The percent of participation is contrasted with these two variables. None has a significant correlation with a criterion variable.

Factor 6 is the parent's assessment of student conduct. All aspects are significantly related to the criterion of understanding. We retained variable 30, Student misconduct in the classroom (P).

Factors 7 and 8 have inexplicable pairs of variables, none of which have significant relationships to a criterion variable.

Factor 9 focuses on the correlation between criticism of athletic performance and scheduling athletic events for week nights. A significant relationship to quiescence led us to retain variable 17, *No. of athletic events scheduled weekday nights*.

Factor 10 contains two related variables that have significant, but different, criterion relationships. We kept both variable 33, *Lack of high school dropouts* and variable 37, *Pupil-teacher ratio, 9-12*.

Factor 11 indicates that if administrators and parents are brought into policy on corporal punishment, so are students. Only student participation has a significant relationship with a criterion variable -- quiescence. We kept variable 9, *Student participation in discipline*.

Factor 12 shows pupil-teacher ratio in grades 7-8 to be positively related to the percent of eighth graders entering high school. Only the percent of eighth graders going on is significantly related to a criterion -- quiescence. We kept it: variable 27, *Percent of eighth graders entering ninth grade*.

Factor 13 merely shows that schools with social clubs generally have superintendents who feel that the goals of such clubs are inconsistent with educational goals. Neither variable has a significant criterion relationship.

Factor 14 contains variables relative to scheduling athletic events on weekends or after school. Only one has a significant criterion relationship. We retained it: variable 16, *No. of athletic events scheduled weekdays after school*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 4: When athletic events are scheduled during school hours, why does student participation in and planning of student programs decrease -- even though some of the participation is related to athletic activity?

Factor 9: Is there a casual relationship between scheduling athletic events on weekday nights and greater criticism of the losing teams?

F. Bibliography

Bush, R. N. "Principles of Successful Teacher-Pupil Relationships." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 39, No. 6 (March, 1958).

Evaluative Criteria. Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Washington, D. C., 1950.

Flanagan, John C., Pumroy, Shirley S. & Tuska, Shirley A. "A Tool for Measuring Children's Behavior." The Elementary School Journal. Vol. 59, No. 3 (December, 1958).

French, J. R. "The Disruption in Cohesion of Groups." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 36 (1941).

Kindred, Leslie W. School Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Newsom, N. W. and Langfitt, R. E. Administrative Practices in Large High Schools. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Reddick, D. C. Journalism and the School Paper. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1949.

Schorling, R. Student Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.

III. PROGRAM

A. Variables

1. Purpose of retarded student program: social training

   (2F-30): Purposes of retarded child program in the district:

   a. social training
   b. vocational training
   c. training in personal care
   d. other

   (Code: 0--not a stated purpose
   1--a stated purpose)

2. Purpose of retarded student program: vocational training

   (2F-30): See 1

3. Purpose of retarded student program: training in personal care

   (2F-30): See 1

4. Purpose of retarded student program: other

   (2F-30): See 1

5. Retarded children, identification of (2F-31)

   (Code: 0--no specified procedure
   1--by test elsewhere
   2--by test at school)

6. Purpose of gifted student program: acceleration

   (2F-33): Purposes of gifted child program in district:

   a. acceleration
   b. enrichment
   c. other

   (Code: 0--not a stated purpose
   1--a stated purpose

7. Purpose of gifted student program: enrichment

   (2F-33): See 6

8. Purpose of gifted student program: other

(2F-33): See 6

9. Gifted child, identification of (2F-34)

(Code: 0--no specified procedure
1--by test elsewhere
2--by tests at school

10. Adult education, enrollment

(2F-35): Total enrollment in adult education classes, 1961-62 school year

11. Adult education program, percent devoted to high school credit (2F-36)

12. Adult education program, percent devoted to citizenship training (2F-36)

13. Adult education support, percent from tuition (2F-37)

14. Adult education support, percent from local taxes (2F-37)

15. Summer school program, enrollment in 1961 (2F-38)

16. Purpose of summer school program: remedial

(2F-39): Purposes of summer school program:

a. remedial
b. acceleration
c. enrichment
d. leisure time activities
e. other

(Code: 0--not a stated purpose
1--a stated purpose)

17. Purpose of summer school program: acceleration

(2F-39): See 16

18. Purpose of summer school program: enrichment

(2F-39): See 16

19. Purpose of summer school program: leisure time activities

(2F-39): See 16

20. Purpose of summer school program: other

(2F-39): See 16

21. Gifted student program, percent of pupils in (2F-32)

22. Audio-visual facilities

(2F-42): Audio-visual facilities in district:

slide projector(s)	(95% yes)
opaque projector(s)	(93% yes)
classroom(s) equipped for audiovisual (AV)	(77% yes)
* special AV room(s) and/or television receiver(s)	(86% yes)
television broadcasting facility	(19% yes)
sound film projector(s)	(95% yes)
AV library of instructional films	(74% yes)
closed circuit television	(11% yes)
radio broadcasting facility	(15% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .958
Scalability, items = .879
Scalability, individuals = .771

23. Teaching method changes, no. of

(S-30): In recent years has the district made any substantial changes in teaching methods? What changes have been made and when?

24. Controversies over teaching methods, no. of

(S-31): With respect to what teaching methods has there been some citizen controversy in your district in recent years?

25. Teachers of gifted students, special provisions (S-33)

(Code: 1--financial, training, or lighter load
0--none or anything else)

26. Teachers of retarded students, special provisions (S-34)

(Code: see 25)

---

* Functional equivalents: a composite item was formed.

27.	Current NDEA experimental programs, no. of	(2F-27)
28.	Current non-NDEA experimental programs, no. of	(2F-27)
29.	Other innovations, no. of (2F-28): Not primarily experimental programs.	
30.	Pupils in retarded program, percent of	(2F-29)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	101	.93	1.00	.24	-3.73	09	-08	21	-14
2	100	.65	1.00	.48	-.63	-02	-11	12	-01
3	101	.85	1.00	.36	-1.98	20*	-06	23	-19
4	101	.45	.00	.50	.22	-08	00	14	-13
5	101	1.88	2.00	.35	-3.01	14	-08	14	-03
6	75	.48	.00	.50	.08	11	-30*	00	05
7	75	.96	1.00	.20	-4.70	13	-14	05	15
8	75	.15	.00	.35	2.00	07	-18	-10	04
9	74	1.96	2.00	.26	-6.71	-10	-33**	-30*	07
10	88	7369.61	830.00	15498.61	3.06	-13	-25*	02	07
11	75	16.31	5.00	22.28	1.65	09	-09	09	10
12	73	8.41	2.00	16.11	3.31	-29*	-06	02	24
13	68	39.38	28.50	37.38	.44	20	03	-13	24
14	65	19.09	.00	26.50	1.32	-10	-12	18	-16
15	87	5224.25	830.00	16068.05	5.08	-06	-13	-21	06
16	90	.86	1.00	.35	-2.02	-03	03	21	08
17	90	.54	1.00	.50	-.18	19	-09	08	-01
18	90	.74	1.00	.44	-1.12	09	-21*	-09	-23
19	90	.28	.00	.45	.99	-01	-14	-12	02
20	90	.23	.00	.42	1.26	-04	-11	03	-02
21	59	5.34	3.00	5.90	1.41	01	15	18	04
22	122	5.66	6.00	1.77	-1.13	03	-21*	-05	-05
23	150	2.83	3.00	1.91	.15	01	-14	-07	-19
24	153	.59	.00	.88	1.59	-04	-14	-06	-06
25	136	.21	.00	.40	1.46	00	-08	07	12

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
26	143	.92	.00	2.26	3.15	01	04	-02	10
27	103	.56	.00	.97	1.72	-11	-22*	-15	-03
28	101	2.52	2.00	2.33	.97	-01	-17	-10	-08
29	87	2.41	2.00	2.15	.92	00	-22*	04	07
30	99	1.74	1.00	2.26	3.57	-12	-06	-06	-13

C. Factor analysis

		Factors										
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	77							82				
2	64			51				44				
3	75							80				
4	70					41						
5	51				-45							
6	56			68								
8	73									80		
10	80	73										
11	69										73	
12	69		67									
13	82				51							
14	66	61										
15	86	78						-40				
16	74								79			
17	63			59								
18	68			40								62
19	80											83
20	83								-73			
21	84		60			-54						
22	68										71	
23	71						65					
24	76						81					
25	68	63										
26	75				82							
27	65					79						
28	76	64										
29	71	68										
30	72		79									

Variables 7 and 9 were omitted for lack of variance.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis allowed us to drop one variable. Factor 1 consists of various programs and adult education's support by local taxes. We retained only variable 29, *No. of other innovations*, from this group. (Only adult education enrollment among the other variables has a significant criterion correlation.)

We also retained: variable 3, *Purpose of retarded student program: training in personal care*; variable 6, *Purpose of gifted student program: acceleration*; variable 12, *Adult education program: percent devoted to citizenship training*; variable 18, *Purpose of summer school program: enrichment*; variable 22, *Audio-visual facilities*; and, variable 27, *No. of current NDEA experimental programs*. Variable 9 was dropped for lack of variance. Its tabled criterion correlations are unreliable.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Does, in fact, the availability of *local* tax money determine the breadth of program as indicated by the variables with loadings on this factor?

Factor 3: For what reason do the same districts seem to emphasize different functions in their special programs -- i.e., vocational training for retarded children, acceleration for gifted children, and acceleration and enrichment for summer session work?

Factor 4: Why do districts that test for retardation among their pupils tend not to make special provisions for teachers of retarded pupils?

Factor 5: Why do districts with more NDEA programs tend to have fewer of their pupils in gifted programs?

F. Bibliography

Creating a Good Environment for Learning. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 11th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1954.

Dunlap, James M. "The Education of Children with High Mental Ability," Education for Exceptional Children and Youth. (ed. William M. Cruickshank & G. Orville Johnson) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (ed. Chester W. Harris) New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Evaluative Criteria. Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Washington 6, D. C., 1950.

Featherstone, W. B. Teaching the Slow Learner. New York: Teachers College, 1951.

The Gifted Child. (ed. Paul Witty) American Association for Gifted Children, New York: D. C. Heath, 1951.

Group Planning in Education. Department of Supervision & Curriculum Development, NEA, 2nd Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1945.

Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. (ed. Malcolm Knowles) Chicago: Adult Education Association of the United States, 1960.

Ingram, Christine. Education of the Slow Learning Child. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.

Passow, A. Harry. "Enrichment Education for the Gifted." Education for the Gifted. (ed. Henry B. Nelson) National Society for the Study of Education, 57th Yearbook, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

IV. SERVICES

A. Variables

1. Guidance program: scope

(2F-48):

a.	individual cumulative records	(97% yes)
b.	occupational information library	(86% yes)
c.	interest (aptitude) inventories	(83% yes)
d.	personality testing	(53% yes)
e.	research program (s)	(37% yes)
f.	college catalogue library	(87% yes)
g.	intelligence testing	(96% yes)
h.	achievement testing	(96% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .976
Scalability, items = .860
Scalability, individuals = .844

2. Counseling activities: scope

(2F-48):

a.	follow-up for graduates	(54% yes)
b.	follow-up for non-graduates	(34% yes)
c.	orientation (life adjustment) classes	(41% yes)
d.	home visits by counselors	(54% yes)
e.	homeroom counseling	(78% yes)
f.	group counseling	(79% yes)
g.	individual counseling	(92% yes)
h.	in-service counselor training	(53% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .894
Scalability, items = .681
Scalability, individuals = .584

3. Transportation services: scope

(2F-47):

a.	student field trips in district	(85% yes)
b.	student field trips outside district	(77% yes)
c.	students participating in athletic events	(87% yes)
d.	student spectators at athletic events	(46% yes)
e.	students participating in non-athletic events	(74% yes)
f.	student spectators at non-athletic events	(32% yes)
g.	others without charge	(16% yes)
h.	others with charge	(11% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .952
Scalability, items = .789
Scalability, individuals = .851

4. Health services: organization

(2F-49):

*a.	full time and/or part time nurse for each school	(76% yes)
b.	health instruction in curriculum	(96% yes)
c.	health advisory counsel	(36% yes)
d.	district safety coordinator	(40% yes)
e.	cumulative health records	(91% yes)
f.	dental instruction in curriculum	(63% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .938
Scalability, items = .735
Scalability, individuals = .798

5. Health services: range of

(2F-49):

a.	vision tests conducted	(93% yes)
b.	regular physical exams	(58% yes)
c.	immunization program	(84% yes)
d.	tuberculin testing	(71% yes)
e.	hearing tests conducted	(94% yes)
f.	regular dental exams	(48% yes)
g.	x-ray examinations	(39% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .925
Scalability, items = .719
Scalability, individuals = .687

* Functional equivalents: a composite item was formed.

6. School welfare activities, number of

   (S-18): In what ways does the school district find itself engaged in welfare activities for its pupils?

7. School relations with welfare agencies: coordination

   (S-19): How would you characterize the relationship between the school district and local welfare agencies?

8. School relations with welfare agencies: number of joint programs

   (2F-40d): What programs or activities are undertaken by the district in cooperation with welfare organizations?

9. Counselor-pupil ratio

   (2F-13, 17): Number of full time guidance personnel per 1000 pupils

10. Transportation: number of accidents (S-28)

11. Expenditure for window breakage

    (2F-41, 17): Expenditure for 1960-61 window breakage per student

12. Other special services, number of (2F-50)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	123	6.34	7.00	1.77	-1.81	-02	-18*	-02	-15
2	123	4.85	5.00	2.18	-.39	-02	-24**	00	-08
3	123	4.27	4.00	1.89	-.54	04	20*	-05	-08
4	123	4.05	4.00	1.50	-.30	-16	-27**	-18	-03
5	123	4.86	5.00	1.62	-.56	-06	17	-07	12
6	151	2.83	3.00	1.57	.49	-08	-01	06	00
7	151	4.58	5.00	.73	-2.52	09	-10	22*	-14
8	114	1.10	1.00	1.54	2.21	-01	-12	08	-03
9	121	.91	.74	.85	4.52	05	22*	-01	03
10	148	.42	.00	.60	1.14	-11	-25**	-11	05
11	98	.19	.11	.21	1.78	-05	-12	-07	06
12	88	2.68	2.00	2.86	1.47	04	-04	00	05

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5
1	77			86		
2	74	40		75		
3	70				83	
4	69	80				
5	62	57				42
6	34				46	
7	81					
8	58		-42			
9	62			49		
10	67		79			
11	52	64				
12	61	65				

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 contains both aspects of health services -- organization and services performed, counseling activities, other services, and window breakage. Only health service organization and counseling activities are significantly related to a criterion variable. Because counseling activities has loadings on two factors, we took the other variable with its high, single loading as more representative: variable 4, Health services: organization.

Factor 3 has the three guidance variables, all of which are significantly related to the criterion of quiescence -- two negatively and one positively. We kept variable 1, Scope of guidance program, and variable 9, Counselor-pupil ratio.

Three other variables were retained: variable 3, Scope of transportation services; variable 7, School relations with welfare organizations: coordination; and, variable 10, Transportation: no. of accidents. They do not appear on any factor with another variable significantly related to a criterion variable.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Services for the most part seem to be interrelated because of some variable from another area. The relationship between window breakage and counseling services suggests this, for instance (Factor 1).

There appear to be conditions that demand alleviation, and various combinations of services reflect these conditions.

F. Bibliography

Coleman, William. "Some Criteria for Evaluating Elementary School Guidance Services," The Elementary School Journal. Vol. 55 (January, 1955).

Erickson, Clifford E. and Smith, Glenn E. Organization and Administration of Guidance Services. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947.

Byrd, O. E. School Health Sourcebook. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Froehlich, C. L. Guidance Services in Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

A Guide to School Business Services. Office of the Superintendent of Schools, San Diego County, 1956.

Harnett, Arthur L. and Shaw, John H. Effective School Health Education. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, 1959.

Harris, R. C. The Organization of Guidance Services in Selected California Cities. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1949.

Health Education. Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education, NEA, Washington, D. C., 1961.

Kefauver, G. N. and Hand, H. Appraising Guidance in Secondary Schools. New York: Macmillan, 1941.

V. STAFF: TEACHERS

A. Variables

1. Teaching method changes, no. of

   (See III:23)

2. Controversies over teaching methods, number of

   (See III:24)

3. Parent-teacher conferences, no. of

   (S-32): Are parent-teacher conferences scheduled with all parents in this district? How many times per year?

4. Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given teachers (S-32a)

   (Code: 0--none
   1--other
   2--training sessions)

5. Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given parents

   (S-32b): What information about conference procedures is provided parents?

   (Code: 0--none
   1--other preparation
   2--pamphlet distributed)

6. Staff loyalty to administration

   (S-41): To what extent would you expect members of the staff -- as a whole -- to volunteer support if the administration were criticized?

7. Staff support, number of instances (S-42)

8. Teacher-administrator relations: morale (S)

   (See I:55)

9. Staff running for political office

(S-44): In recent years, have any members of the school staff achieved -- or tried to achieve -- elected public office?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

10. Teacher turnover, number of means used to minimize (S-46)

11. Teacher-administrator relations (BP)

(See I:37)

12. Teacher satisfaction

(T-1): To what extent do you feel teachers in this district are generally satisfied with each of the following:

a. general working conditions?
b. salaries?
c. job security?
e. status in the community?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .920
Scalability, items = .734
Scalability, individuals = .645

13. Teacher satisfaction: academic freedom (T-1d)

14. Teacher participation in policy making, number of instances

(T-17): Are district teachers presently represented on any of the following:

a. on an advisory committee of the board of education? (25% yes)
b. on an administrative council? (26% yes)
c. at board meetings? (49% yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .920
Scalability, items = .760
Scalability, individuals = .563

15. Overall teacher participation (individual) in school elections

(T-33): Tax, bond issue, board member, and budget elections.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .925
Scalability, items = .800
Scalability, individuals = .714

16. Teacher membership in professional organization, percent of (T-18a)

17. Professional organization: economic benefits of

(T-18b): What economic benefits do members receive:

a. salary matters?	(49% yes)
b. pension matters?	(6% yes)
c. life insurance?	(8% yes)
d. health insurance?	(23% yes)
e. car or home insurance?	(13% yes)
f. fringe benefits (e.g., vacations)	(33% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .931
Scalability, items = .690
Scalability, individuals = .652

18. Teaching methods: audio-visual aids

(See III:22)

19. Professional organization: (financial) negotiation by (T-18c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

20. Professional organization: (dismissal or tenure) negotiation by (T-18c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

21. Professional organization: (profession, policies, training) negotiation by (T-18c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

22. Professional organization: difficulties with administration (T-18d)

(Code: 0--none
1--if any)

23. Teacher membership in local union, percent of (T-19a)

24. Local union: difficulties with administration (T-19d)

(Code: 0--none
1--if any)

25. Teacher participation (as a group) in district election campaign, total

(T-32b): Which of these forms has teacher participation taken:

a. contributing funds? (51% yes)
b. soliciting votes? (70% yes)
c. endorsing candidates? (44% yes)
d. endorsing financial issues? (81% yes)
e. public discussions? (67% yes)
f. campaign planning? (56% yes)
g. preparation of campaign materials? (49% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .890
Scalability, items = .713
Scalability, individuals = .535

26. Teacher participation (individual): district election campaigns (T-33)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

27. Teacher participation (individual): board member elections (T-33a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

28. Teacher participation (individual): board recall elections (T-33a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

29. Teacher participation (individual): bond issue elections (T-33a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

30. Teacher participation (individual): tax elections (T-33a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

31. Teacher participation (individual): budget elections (T-33a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

32. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: contributing funds (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

33. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: soliciting funds (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

34. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: endorsing candidates (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

35. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: endorsing issues (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

36. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: public discussions (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

37. Teacher participation (individual) in elections: campaign planning (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

38. Teacher participation (individual) in election campaigns: prepare materials (T-33b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

39. Teacher participation (individual) in district election campaigns, amount of

(T): See variables 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .925
Scalability, items = .834
Scalability, individuals = .634

40. Teachers leaving district annually, percent of (2F-9, 7)

41. Teachers living in district, percent of (2F-11)

42. Leadership positions in community, number of (T-21)

43. Community affairs, number of group contributions by teachers (T-22)

44. Staff group support of administration, no. of

(See I:39)

45. Teacher-administrator relations: morale (T)

(See I:42)

46. Teacher-administrator relations (general) (T)

(See I:44)

47. Teacher participation (as a group) in district election campaigns (T-32)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Note: Because of the small N, (36), the following types of elections were eliminated as separate variables, but are listed here with their marginals:

a.	board member	(42% yes)
b.	board recall	(6% yes)
c.	bond issue	(69% yes)
d.	tax	(64% yes)
e.	budget	(11% yes)

48. Pupil-teacher ratio, K-6

(See II:35)

49. Pupil-teacher ratio, 7-8

(See II:36)

50. Pupil-teacher ratio, 9-12

(See II:37)

51. Teachers, K-6, with any degree, percent of (2F-8)

52. Teachers, 7-8, with any degree, percent of (2F-8)

53. Teachers, 9-12, with any degree, percent of (2F-8)

54. Teachers, 7-8, with master's degree, percent of (2F-8)

55. Teachers, 9-12, with master's degree, percent of (2F-8)

56. Teachers, 13-14, with master's degree, percent of (2F-8)

B. Data

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
3	151	1.05	.00	1.56	1.67	-11	-01	04	03
4	60	1.32	1.00	.67	-.47	32*	02	-28	03
5	58	.91	1.00	.60	.03	-10	-21	13	02
6	151	4.01	4.00	.92	-1.30	15	-23	00	-02
7	151	.46	.00	.72	2.39	-03	-13	-06	06
9	154	.40	.00	.49	.40	-16	-32***	-04	03
10	151	2.80	3.00	1.26	-.06	14	-06	-13	04
12	154	2.84	3.00	1.01	-.50	21*	01	-12	-14
13	154	4.34	4.00	.70	-.92	02	08	01	-16
14	153	1.01	1.00	.99	.59	03	-17*	-10	-12
15	89	2.44	3.00	1.07	-.28	-03	-16	02	27*
16	150	81.21	95.00	30.42	-1.84	05	-08	01	-09
17	138	1.33	1.00	1.28	.84	-02	-14	-14	-03
19	128	.69	1.00	.46	-.81	10	-06	-08	11
20	127	.08	.00	.27	3.13	-01	-22*	11	-06
21	127	.52	1.00	.50	-.08	04	-20*	07	03
22	140	.21	.00	.40	1.44	-16	-06	-12	04
23	149	2.69	.00	9.77	5.38	-19*	-10	-16	03
24	35	.57	1.00	.50	-.29	-19	-25	-09	18
25	43	4.19	4.00	2.03	-.40	-26	04	-14	12
26	151	.60	1.00	.49	-.42	-06	-24**	-12	01
27	86	.73	1.00	.44	-1.05	-07	01	17	00
28	74	.14	.00	.34	2.14	-11	05	-08	-02
29	88	.80	1.00	.40	-1.46	02	-23*	23	-01
30	85	.72	1.00	.45	-.97	06	-09	-02	27*

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
31	75	.31	.00	.46	.84	-03	10	05	29*
32	90	.51	1.00	.50	-.04	-14	-09	-02	14
33	88	.74	1.00	.44	-1.09	-05	05	12	-10
34	86	.64	1.00	.48	-.58	-02	14	12	08
35	86	.81	1.00	.39	-1.61	-11	-08	05	05
36	89	.78	1.00	.42	-1.32	10	-11	30*	27*
37	87	.51	1.00	.50	-.02	-17	-24*	-01	09
38	87	.53	1.00	.50	-.12	-20	-13	-06	04
39	89	3.79	4.00	1.95	-.33	-14	-15	05	13
40	105	11.86	12.00	5.46	.38	06	01	00	02
41	108	70.38	79.50	27.47	-.86	25**	-11	-04	00
42	127	2.33	2.00	1.93	.66	25**	-09	03	-04
43	141	1.32	1.00	1.27	.97	07	-22**	08	11
47	149	.30	.00	.46	.86	06	-23**	-13	-03
51	102	85.65	92.00	16.34	-1.51	15	-24**	-09	-01
52	103	93.32	99.00	13.90	-3.36	-04	-07	-25**	-02
53	95	97.37	99.00	4.45	-4.26	14	-12	-18	16
54	100	28.96	23.50	22.17	.89	-03	-05	-08	-16
55	96	38.89	36.00	18.41	.62	05	-06	-02	-04
56	11	83.09	86.00	14.06	-.81	07	35	54	04

C. Factor analysis

		Factors															
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	69																72
2	71																68
3	72								-67								
4	98				-44			47									
5	82								75								
6	65						-73										
7	70															76	
8	61				61												
9	67	56															
10	82										55						
11	72											79					
12	60																
13	66								48								
14	65	40															
15	64	62															
16	85												84				
17	62																
18	74	47															
19	78							55									
20	69				71												
21	72													80			
22	62			-52													
23	72												-59				
24	102*						67										
25	106*	79															

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
								Factors									
39	79	76															
40	66										44						
41	82														86		
42	84					89											
43	59																
44	82															75	
45	80			82													
46	83			84													
48	78						58			40							
49	75										-78						
50	71									78							
51	83							79									
52	81							68									
53	63																
54	87		90														
55	82		87														

* Unstable because of low N.

Variables 26-38 were omitted because they are components of homogeneous scales (variables 15 and 39).

Variable 47 was omitted as artifactually correlated with variable 25.

Variable 56 was dropped because of low N.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis did not enable us to drop many variables from this division. In fact, we dropped only one following the factor analysis.

Factor 1 has a number of participation variables, but only three have significant correlations with a criterion variable. Two of these have different relationships and were kept: variable 9, *Staff running for political office*, and, variable 15, *Overall individual teacher participation in school elections*.

Variables 29 and 37 were omitted as redundant to variable 26, to which they are artifactually correlated.

The other variables retained were: variable 4, *Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given teachers*; variable 12, *Teacher satisfaction*; variable 20, *Negotiation by professional organization (dismissal or tenure)*; variable 21, *Negotiation by professional organization (profession, policies, training)*; variable 23, *Percent of teachers in local union*; variable 26, *Individual teacher participation in district elections*; variable 30, *Individual teacher participation in tax elections*; variable 31, *Individual teacher participation in budget elections*; variable 36, *Individual teacher campaign participation: public discussions*; variable 41, *Percent of teachers living in district*; variable 42, *No. of community leadership positions held by teachers*; variable 43, *No. of group contributions by teachers to community*; variable 47, *Group teacher participation in election campaigns*; variable 51, *Percent of grades K-6 teachers with any degree*; and, variable 52, *Percent of grades 7-8 teachers with any degree*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 4: Is negotiation by the professional organization on dismissal and tenure matters helpful to teacher-administration relations? Why does preparation for teachers on parent-teacher conferences relate negatively with teacher-administration relations?

Factor 6: Why does administration difficulties with local teacher unions relate negatively to staff loyalty -- as seen by the superintendent?

Factor 8: Why do districts with more parent-teacher conferences have less preparation for the parents attending those conferences?

F. Bibliography

Barr, A. S. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 16 (June, 1948).

Bush, R. N. "Principles of Successful Teacher-Pupil Relationships," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 38 (March, 1958).

Creating A Good Environment For Learning. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 11th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1954.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (ed. Chester W. Harris) New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Gipe, M. W. Parent-Teacher Conferences. Unpublished Doctoral Disseration, Stanford University, 1955.

Grant, Robert T. The Effectiveness of Structured Parent-Teacher Conferences on Parental Attitudes Toward Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.

Homfeld, M. J. A Parent-Teacher Conference Program in the Menlo Park Schools, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

Howsam, R. B. Who's A Good Teacher? Burlingame, California: California Teachers Association, 1960.

Kirkpatrick, Robert N. The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Perceived Staff Promotional Policies. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.

Learning and the Teacher. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 16th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1959.

McCall, W. A. Measure of Teacher Merit. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Public Instruction, Publication No. 284, 1952.

Modern Methods in Elementary Education. (ed. Merle Ohlsen) New York: Henry Holt, 1959.

Trump, J. Lloyd and Baynham, Dorsey. Guide to Better Schools. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961.

VI. STAFF: OTHERS

A. Variables

1. Orientation of maintenance staff to policy

   (See I:26)

2. In-service training for maintenance staff (S-38)

   (Code: 0--none
   1--continuing and regular
   2--staff is sent to "schools"
   3--other)

3. Maintenance staff: inclusion in decision making

   (See I:27)

4. Maintenance work: superintendent's satisfaction with (S-40)

5. Staff loyalty to administration

   (See V:6)

6. Staff support: no. of instances

   (See V:7)

7. Staff running for political office

   (See V:9)

8. Non-teacher staff organization (T-20)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

9. Non-teacher organization: (financial) negotiation by (T-20a)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

10. Non-teacher organization: (working conditions) negotiation by (T-20a)

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

11. Non-teacher organization: difficulties with administration (T-20b)

    (Code: 0--none
    1--if any)

12. Organization: authority to whom custodians directly responsible

    (See I:45)

13. Central office staff-pupil ratio

    (2F-14, 17): number of central office staff members per 1000 pupils.

14. Central office staff members, number of (2F-14)

15. Central office staff certificated of credentialed, percent of (2F-15)

16. Central office staff with any degree, percent of (2F-16)

17. Central office staff with master's degree, percent of (2F-16)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
2	150	1.92	2.00	1.23	-.62	-02	-20*	-10	-05
4	153	4.12	4.00	.80	-.61	08	-02	-02	09
8	151	.41	.00	.49	.36	01	-25**	-11	-02
9	49	.55	1.00	.50	-.20	-25	-16	-22	03
10	49	.33	.00	.47	.74	-27	-17	-09	02
11	57	.19	.00	.40	1.56	-19	-07	-13	15
13	117	3.03	2.41	2.21	1.39	04	-03	-03	03
14	115	180.36	18.00	699.48	8.35	-10	-08	13	00
15	111	37.33	37.00	19.51	.40	-15	-19	-08	-05
16	114	88.50	99.00	25.34	-2.61	02	-32***	00	-05
17	114	74.00	84.50	27.97	-1.19	-04	-13	-03	05

C. Factor analysis

		Factors					
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	57			73			
2	60				51		
3	55				69		
4	57			65			
5	51						67
6	38						54
7	66	50				59	
9	63	74					
10	69					-66	
11	69	78					
12	64				57		
13	42						
14	57	51					
15	53					66	
16	82		90				
17	84		91				

Variable 8 was omitted from the factor analysis because of artifactual correlation with variables 9-11.

D. Variables retained

Only three of the variables have a significant correlation with a criterion variable. No factor includes more than one of them. We retained: variable 2, In-service training for maintenance staff; variable 8, Non-teacher staff organization; and, variable 16, Percent of central office staff with a college degree.

E. Questions suggested by the factor analysis results

Factor 1: Is there a causal relationship that accounts for the positive correlation between financial negotiation by a staff organization and difficulties with the administration?

Factor 3: Why is orientation of maintenance staff to school policy related to the superintendent's satisfaction with the maintenance work while in-service training is not?

Factor 5: What accounts for the negative relationship between percent of certificated central office personnel and negotiations on working conditions by a staff organization?

F. Bibliography

Barbour, Julius E. The Selection and Instruction of Public School Custodians in Selected School Systems. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1954.

VII. DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

A. Variables

1. Administrative units in district, number of

   (S-69): Do any other school districts overlap yours?

2. Consolidation, controversies over (S-70)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

3. Unification, controversies over (S-71)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

4. Grades served, number of in 1940 (1F-4)

5. Grades served, number of in 1950 (1F-4)

6. Grades served, number of in 1960 (1F-4)

7. Consolidation, years since last move

   (1F-5): Years from 1962 since last consolidation

8. Unification, years since last move

   (1F-6): Years from 1962 since last unification

9. District dependence on federal aid

   (1F-11, 12, 13): Ratio of amount received under P. L. 874 to all federal aid.

10. Pupil enrollment, ratio 1950/40 (1F-1)

11. Pupil enrollment, ratio 1960/50 (1F-1)

12. Pupil enrollment, 1960 (1F-1)

13. District population, ratio 1950/40 (1F-2)

14. District population, ratio 1960/50 (1F-2)

15. District population, 1960 (1F-2)

16.	District area (square miles), ratio 1950/40	(1F-3)
17.	District area (square miles), ratio 1960/50	(1F-3)
18.	District area in square miles, 1960	(1F-3)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	152	.38	.00	1.29	4.70	00	00	-08	-06
2	135	.44	.00	.52	.56	-11	-06	-08	-08
3	124	.15	.00	.38	2.35	-16	-08	-13	-08
4	130	11.91	12.00	2.09	-1.66	-05	-02	-01	10
5	131	12.12	12.00	2.02	-1.98	-02	-07	02	08
6	134	12.28	12.00	1.94	-2.52	-01	-07	04	09
7	50	9.70	7.00	10.11	2.78	-23	-20	16	-07
8	22	12.46	8.00	12.83	1.18	-21	-17	21	31
9	103	37.67	.00	44.34	.38	-04	-03	27*	-23*
10	125	1.39	1.14	.84	4.76	-15	-20*	01	-30**
11	132	1.83	1.54	1.04	3.61	-06	-14	00	-30**
12	140	44712.64	9245.50	110941.64	5.76	-08	-16	-08	00
13	119	1.37	1.18	.56	2.79	-13	02	03	-30**
14	123	1.55	1.22	.92	3.04	-03	-10	03	-32**
15	129	287542.99	44791.00	826134.53	6.67	-08	-11	-06	-01
16	118	1.30	1.00	1.23	5.81	06	09	11	-12
17	123	1.32	1.00	.92	4.37	04	06	09	00
18	131	368.82	92.00	937.36	6.20	-13	-07	-04	-06

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	57						47	
2	90					91		
3	74					75		
4	92	94						
5	95	96						
6	94	96						
7	67						-59	
8	98				88			
9	64		48				57	
10	38		53					
11	86	91						
12	97			96				
13	82		65					57
14	91		92					
15	97			97				
16	78							87
17	40						60	
18	71				74			

D. Variables retained

Only five of the variables have a significant relationship with one or more criterion variables. Of these, one could be dropped after examination of the factor analysis results. Factor 2 has both the change in district population from 1940 to 1950 and from 1950 to 1960.

We retained: variable 9, District dependence on federal aid; variable 10, Ratio of 1950 to 1940 pupil enrollment; variable 11, Ratio of 1960 to 1950 pupil enrollment; and, variable 14, Ratio of 1960 to 1950 district population.

We also retained variable 12, 1960 pupil enrollment for later analysis. It was kept in order to see the locus (e.g., in small or large districts) of important relationships.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 5: Why do districts that have trouble with unification also have difficulty with consolidation moves? Does one move fail so they try the other?

F. Bibliography

Dawson, Howard, *et al*. *Your School District*. National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1948.

School District Reorganization: Policies and Procedures. U. S. Office of Education, Special Series No. 5, Washington, D. C., 1957.

"A Statistical Survey of School District Organization in the U. S., 1954-55," *White House Conference on Education*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

VIII. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: STAFF

A. Variables

1. Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 1-6 (2F-57, 58)
2. Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 7-8 (2F-57, 58)
3. Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 9-12 (2F-57, 58)
4. Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 13-14 (2F-57, 58)
5. Mean salary: ratio of local to state, grades 1-6 (2F-59)*
6. Mean salary: ratio of local to state, grades 7-8 (2F-59)*
7. Mean salary: ratio of local to state, grades 9-12 (2F-59)*
8. Median teacher salary, grades 1-6 (2F-60)
9. Median teacher salary, grades 7-8 (2F-60)
10. Median teacher salary, grades 9-12 (2F-60)
11. Median teacher salary, grades 13-14 (2F-60)
12. Teacher salary levels: no. of criteria used

    (2F-61):
    a. teaching experience in district (94% yes)
    b. teaching experience outside district (92% yes)
    c. academic degree (95% yes)
    d. units of work beyond degree (62% yes)
    e. military service (59% yes)
    f. extra duties (59% yes)
    g. non-teaching work experience (18% yes)
    h. merit ratings (11% yes)
    i. other (6% yes)

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

---

* See Section F for state data source.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .931
Scalability, items = .645
Scalability, individuals = .806

13. Organization: authority to whom teachers directly responsible (2F-62)

(Code: 0--other
1--to principal or vice principal)

14. Organization: authority to whom custodian directly responsible

(See VI:12)

15. Teacher supervision: no. of evaluations per year

(2F-64): a. of first year teachers
b. of second year teachers
c. of third year teachers
d. of teachers, 4-6 years of service
e. of teachers beyond 6th year of service

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .998
Scalability, items = .986
Scalability, individuals = .971

16. Teacher hiring: no. of persons involved

(S-35): What persons are officially involved in the selection of a new teacher?

17. Teacher dismissal: immediate firing (See also 22)

(T-27): Suppose that a poor teacher would not resign. Which of these alternatives would be the most likely action of the administration? Are any of the other alternatives likely to be used in this district?

a. immediate firing
b. build a case for not renewing contract
c. suspension
d. assign unpleasant duties
e. retain, and attempt to improve performance

(Code: 0--not a choice
1--other choices
2--first choice)

18. Teacher dismissal: build case for not renewing contract (See also 23)

(T-27): See 17.

19. Teacher dismissal: suspension (See also 24)

(T-27): See 17.

20. Teacher dismissal: assign unpleasant duties (See also 25)

(T-27): See 17.

21. Teacher dismissal: retain and improve performance (See also 26)

(T-27): See 17.

22. Teacher dismissal: immediate firing

(S-45): See 17.

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 17 and 22) is .17.

23. Teacher dismissal: build case for not renewing contract

(S-45): See 18.

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 18 and 23) is .19.

24. Teacher dismissal: suspension

(S-45): See 19.

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 19 and 24) is .05.

25. Teacher dismissal: assign unpleasant duties

(S-45): See 20.

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 20 and 25) is .08.

26. Teacher dismissal: retain and improve performance

(S-45): See 21.

The correlation between T and S assessments (variables 21 and 26) is .12.

27. Evaluation: shown to teacher (T-3)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

28. Evaluation: discussion with teacher (T-4)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

29. Promotion policy

(T-6, 7, 8):

6. Do teachers participate in any way in the selection of new principals? (6% yes)
7. Are teachers informed of district openings in administrative positions? (54% yes)
8. Is there a pre-service training program for teachers who may become administrators in the district? (22% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .964
Scalability, items = .855
Scalability, individuals = .822

30. Teacher hiring procedure: personal interview (T-9)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

31. Teacher hiring procedure: written exam (T-10)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

32. Basis for determination of teachers' salaries

(T-11): Are individual teacher salaries based on negotiation or on a schedule?

(Code: 0--negotiation
1--schedule
2--both
3--neither)

33. Teacher dismissal: tenure policy

(T-12): To what extent do you feel that this district attempts to keep its salaries down by dismissing teachers before they get tenure?

34. Teacher workshops and study groups on school problems (T-16)

(Code: 0--none
1--scheduled intermittently
2--regularly scheduled)

35. Promotion policy: percent of principals from within district (2F-12, 1)

36. Classroom use of community resource persons

(2F-46):

a. fire department personnel	(85% yes)
b. local government personnel	(81% yes)
c. farm leaders	(38% yes)
d. physicians	(71% yes)
e. dentists	(64% yes)
f. police personnel	(81% yes)
g. business leaders	(82% yes)
h. social workers	(66% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .919
Scalability, items = .687
Scalability, individuals = .533

37. Teacher behavior: policy concerning off-the-job

(T-2): To what extent does district policy suggest off-the-job behavior for each of the following:

a. not smoking in public?
b. not drinking in local establishments?
c. regular attendance at PTA meetings?
d. buying from local merchants?
e. regular attendance at a local church or synagogue?
f. not dating other teachers in the same school?
g. participation in local community activities?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .923
Scalability, items = .754
Scalability, individuals = .692

28. Teacher dismissal: provision for formal hearing (T-28)

(Code: 0--no provision
1--hearing, no appeal
2--hearing and appeal)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with:			
						U	Q	A	P
1	108	1.73	1.73	.30	.03	-08	-30**	-26*	08
2	106	1.66	1.67	.25	-.12	-16	-36***	-35**	15
3	97	1.74	1.78	.28	-1.60	-11	-13	-16	-06
4	15	1.88	1.85	.22	.13	48	-37	-07	-46
5	99	1.01	.99	.13	.22	17	-11	-13	04
6	96	1.03	1.01	.13	.48	19	-20	-16	10
7	90	.99	.98	.11	.14	18	-15	05	00
8	74	5703.16	5662.50	992.37	-.19	02	-05	-15	-03
9	73	5724.93	5700.00	1054.91	.05	00	-11	-15	02
10	70	5925.83	5858.50	1071.47	.10	03	-11	-18	07
11	13	7560.46	7500.00	874.73	.41	12	-14	-18	-20
12	122	4.94	5.00	1.60	-.79	01	-23*	-11	00
13	121	.97	1.00	.18	-5.22	-10	08	06	04
15	123	4.42	5.00	1.32	-2.35	-12	-01	-10	05
16	152	3.02	3.00	1.11	.97	03	-16	-20*	-01
17	153	.42	.00	.69	1.36	04	-05	02	00
18	153	.79	1.00	.81	.40	-16	-17*	-16	10
19	153	.23	.00	.53	2.27	00	-16	00	-09
20	153	.20	.00	.48	2.34	-12	05	-03	08
21	149	1.24	1.00	.83	-.47	06	03	16	-04
22	149	.68	1.00	.76	.60	12	18*	21*	-18
23	149	.98	1.00	.85	.04	-03	-15	-09	04
24	149	.31	.00	.54	1.56	-12	-10	02	-08
25	149	.10	.00	.34	3.60	00	-09	-12	06

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
26	149	1.11	1.00	.80	-.21	02	-10	00	-08
27	148	.51	1.00	.50	-.03	-03	-17*	-28**	03
28	142	.70	1.00	.46	-.90	02	-16	-08	-20*
29	149	.81	1.00	.75	.61	08	-08	11	17
30	153	.86	1.00	.34	-2.11	-02	-12	-18	01
31	151	.15	.00	.35	2.01	-16	-17*	09	-05
32	154	2.80	3.00	.54	-2.85	02	-14	-11	-09
33	152	1.17	1.00	.58	4.36	-01	23**	-04	00
34	154	1.63	2.00	.68	-1.57	11	-15	-05	14
35	115	67.97	79.00	32.59	-.75	02	-24*	10	-14
36	123	5.68	7.00	2.34	-.95	-05	-25**	-14	-03
37	154	3.04	3.00	1.94	.28	13	-01	03	00
38	130	1.38	2.00	.85	-.80	-07	-13	-12	-12

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
		Factors												
1	77									78				
2	87									73				
3	63									71				
4	110*			-85										
5	90	87												
6	91	89												
7	88	89												
8	88													
9	96					88								
10	97	42				82								
11	125*		-61						60					
12	69									54				
14	86		88											
15	58							-74						
16	52							49						
17	76								-55				43	
18	79										-84			
19	83												87	
20	62					46								
21	80										68			
22	64								-71					
23	84					-40								
24	62											46		
25	65									43				

* Unstable because of low N.

Kirkpatrick, Robert N. The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Perceived Staff Promotional Policies. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.

Olson, E. G. School and Community. Pittsburgh: Boxwood Press, 1957.

Personnel Services In Education. 58th Yearbook, II, National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Data Source

National Education Association Research Division. Estimates of School Statistics, 1962-63, Research Report 1962-R13, Washington, D. C., 1962.

IX. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: STUDENTS

A. Variables

1. Discipline: district policy on corporal punishment

   (See II:8)

2. Discipline: student participation in

   (See II:9)

3. Reporting pupil progress: letter grades (2F-51)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

4. Reporting pupil progress: number grades (2F-51)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Reporting pupil progress: written report (2F-51)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

6. Reporting pupil progress: oral report (2F-51)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

7. Reporting pupil progress: other (2F-51)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

8. Basis for pupil evaluation: norm for grade level (2F-52)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

9. Basis for pupil evaluation: classmates' progress (2F-52)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

10. Basis for pupil evaluation: own capacity (2F-52)

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

		Factors												
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
26	76							50	41					
27	76						78							
28	78						81							
29	59			43										
30	73													84
31	70											72		
32	70				76									
33	68				-72									
34	57								48					
35	63												41	
36	56													
37	67											-69		
38	81			72										

Variable 13 was omitted because of low variance.

D. Variables retained

Only one variable was dropped following the factor analysis. Factor 9 has the ratios of high to low salaries for teachers in both grades 1-6 and 7-8. Both have similar criterion variable relationships, so we kept variable 2, Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 7-8.

The other variables retained were: variable 12, Teacher salary levels: criteria used; variable 16, Teacher hiring: no. of persons involved; variable 18, Teacher dismissal: build case for not renewing contract (T); variable 22, Teacher dismissal: immediate firing (S); variable 27, Evaluation shown to teacher; variable 28, Discussion of evaluation with teacher; variable 31, Teacher hiring: written exam; variable 33, Teacher dismissal: tenure policy; variable 35, Percent of principals promoted from within district; and, variable 36, Classroom use of community resource persons.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 5: Is the assignment of unpleasant duties used as a substitute for building a dismissal case against unsatisfactory teachers?

Factor 7: Why do districts that involve more persons in hiring teachers make less frequent evaluations of them after they are hired?

Factor 9: Does a wider range between top and bottom salaries necessitate a broader range of salary criteria?

F. Bibliography

Bottrell, H. R. Teaching Tools. Pittsburgh: Boxwood Press, 1957.

Castetter, William B. Administering The School Personnel Program. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Clapp, Elsie R. The Use of Resources in Education. New York: Harper, 1952.

11. Basis for pupil evaluation: other (2F-52)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

12. Progress reports, no. of K-6 per year (2F-53)

13. Progress reports, no. of 7-8 per year (2F-53)

14. Progress reports, no. of 9-12 per year (2F-53)

15. Promotion policy

(2F-54): Procedures used in decision to retain child in grade.

(Code: 1--decision by school only
2--decision by school only, parent is contacted
3--decision by school, parent must agree
4--decision by parent only)

16. Pupils promoted, average

(2F-55): Mean of the average percent promoted in the grades listed below:

Grade	Mean % Promoted	N
1	92.3	87
2	94.8	87
3	95.0	87
4	[illegible]	[illegible]
5	95.9	88
6	96.1	88
7	94.8	84
8	95.1	83

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
3	124	.94	1.00	.23	-3.84	-10	-08	-04	03
4	124	.32	.00	.47	.76	-02	07	-10	09
5	124	.65	1.00	.48	-.68	-10	-02	-01	01
6	124	.42	.00	.49	.33	02	-14	18	-12
7	124	.21	.00	.41	1.43	08	-12	16	-02
8	124	.67	1.00	.47	-.72	-06	-23**	-16	-14
9	124	.44	.00	.50	.26	06	-11	-04	-05
10	124	.80	1.00	.40	-1.49	-05	03	03	18
11	124	.06	.00	.25	3.55	07	-10	08	-01
12	124	4.69	4.00	1.52	-.62	08	-08	10	-05
13	124	4.81	5.00	1.56	-.71	06	-11	01	00
14	124	4.67	6.00	1.87	-.74	07	-08	10	-07
15	124	2.05	2.00	.51	.09	-06	-08	10	-07
16	88	.96	.96	.24	-.82	-02	-09	-05	00

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	84							90
2	61			-60				
3	67						76	
4	60		50				-53	
5	71			80				
6	53							
7	55		66					
8	56				67			
9	60				71			
10	65					75		
11	68		76					
12	88	91						
13	92	94						
14	77	82						
15	77					72		
16	66				-43		63	

D. Variables retained

Only one variable has a significant relationship with any criterion variable. We kept variable 8, Basis for pupil evaluation: norm for grade level.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 2: Do school districts that use number grades find it necessary to supplement them with other means of evaluation and other means of progress reporting?

Factor 3: Why do districts that use written progress reports tend to have less student participation in discipline?

Factor 4: Does evaluation of pupils based on either grade level or classmate norms result in a lower proportion of promotions?

Factor 5: Do school districts that evaluate pupils according to their capacities find it advisable to bring in parents for the decision on promotion?

Factor 6: Why do districts that use number grades tend not to include the parent in promotion decisions?

F. Bibliography

Administrative Practices in Large High Schools (ed. N. W. Newsom and R. E. Langfitt) New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Cronbach, Lee J. Educational Psychology. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1954.

Educational Psychology, A Book of Readings. (ed. A. P. Coladarci) New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

Elsbree, W. S. and McNally, H. J. Elementary School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Co., 1951.

Grambs, J. D., Iverson, W. and Patterson, F. K. Modern Methods In Secondary Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.

Greene, H. A. and Jorgensen, A. N. The Use and Interpretation of High School Tests. New York: Longmans, Green, 1938.

Ross, C. C. Measurement In Today's Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947.

Strang, Ruth. Reporting to Parents. Practical Suggestions for Teaching, Number 10, New York: Columbia University, 1952.

X. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: FISCAL

A. Variables

1. Long range planning: no. of studies (S-72)

2. Long range planning: master plan (S-73)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes
   2--yes, plan carries to saturation)

3. Budget preparation: teacher recommendations

   (T-13): To what extent, would you say, do budget recommendations in this district originate with the teachers?

4. Budget preparation: teacher participation in (T-14)

   (Code: 0--none
   1--requests or recommendations
   2--group action)

5. Budget preparation: basis for estimates (S-47)

   (Code: 0--money available
   1--educational needs
   2--both 0 and 1
   3--other)

6. Budget preparation: time available

   (S-48, 49): No. of days between the date budget preparations begin and the date the budget is submitted for approval.

7. Budget adoption: final approval

   (S-50): Who makes the final decision on the school district budget?

   (Code: 1--voters
   2--board of education
   3--municipal agency
   4--county agency
   5--state agency)

8. Budget reviewing agency: power to reject and return (S-51a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

9. Budget reviewing agency: power to change total (S-51b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

10. Budget reviewing agency: power to change parts (S-51c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

11. Budget reviewing agency: origin of (S-52)

(Code: 1--appointed
2--elected by electorate larger than school district
3--elected by electorate, smaller
4--elected by electorate, same size)

12. Budget reviewing agency: no. of other public functions (S-53)

13. Property assessment: selection of assessor (S-55)

(Code: 1--by state
2--by county
3--municipal
4--by voters
5--district
6--other or multiple)

14. Property assessment: autonomy of assessor

(S-56): Are district assessments reviewed by an assessor designated by some other governmental agency? By whom?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

15. Property assessment: selection of reviewer

(S-56): See 14

(Code: 1--state
2--county
3--municipal
4--other)

16. Business procedures: use of cost accounting (S-57)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

17. Business procedures: policy on local purchases

(S-58): Does the district have a policy that defines the conditions under which school purchases should be made from local merchants?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

18. Business procedures: no. of estimates on non-bid items

(S-59): How many estimates must the district obtain before purchasing items which do not require formal bids?

19. Budget adoption: agency authorization needed (1F-p.5:2)

(Code: 0--none
1--local
2--county
3--state)

20. Budget: open hearing on

(S-54): Before the budget comes up for adoption, is there a special public meeting held at which the budget is discussed?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with:			
						U	Q	A	P
1	154	1.89	2.00	1.32	.90	-12	-29***	-13	19
2	149	1.03	1.00	.90	-.05	-01	-25**	-07	-12
3	153	2.39	2.00	1.12	.26	-04	13	-16	07
4	150	.75	1.00	.76	.44	-20*	02	-17	07
5	144	2.24	2.00	.69	.68	-17*	-06	-17	02
6	134	142.92	122.50	85.95	.80	-14	-26*	02	16
7	153	2.44	2.00	1.07	1.25	-11	-11	-06	18
8	36	.69	1.00	.46	-.84	21	-28	44	-36
9	36	.42	.00	.49	.34	-15	18	-06	-21
10	36	.53	1.00	.50	-.11	-20	-18	-22	11
11	37	2.51	2.00	1.41	.03	-06	03	00	12
12	39	1.20	1.00	1.04	1.62	-03	05	-63*	71**
13	143	2.85	2.00	1.21	1.02	20*	11	20	-27**
14	146	.49	.00	.50	.06	08	-01	-10	-14
15	63	1.82	2.00	.85	.81	25*	03	22	-42**
16	148	.70	1.00	.46	-.89	05	-04	05	-31**
17	151	.50	1.00	.50	-.01	-06	-16*	-10	-08
18	147	1.78	2.00	1.36	-.36	-14	-19*	02	03
19	136	.64	.00	.95	1.23	-01	-05	00	20
20	153	.61	1.00	.50	-.31	-13	-20*	-12	-03

C. Factor analysis

						Factors				
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	76							81		
2	64					57				50
3	76						85			
4	66						74			
5	42									
6	56					64				
7	67								64	
8	87						-75			
9	98			89						
10	93		-83							
11	97				-64			52		
12	73			-56					44	
13	71		81							
14	84				88					
15	103*		79	48						
16	77									83
17	66					50				
18	63			53						
19	74								83	
20	63					72				

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis allowed us to drop four variables. Factor 2 has two variables relating to the closeness of the assessor and assessment reviewer to the district. We retained only variable 13, _Property assessment_: _selection of assessor locally_.

Factor 5 has four variables, all of which are significantly related to quiescence and nothing else. We kept only variable 20, _Open hearing on budget_.

Other variables retained were: variable 1, _No. of long range planning studies_; variable 4, _Teacher participation in budget preparation_; variable 12, _Budget reviewing agency_: _no. of other functions_; variable 16, _Business procedures_: _use of_ cost accounting; and, variable 18, Business procedures: no. of estimates on non-bid items.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 2: Why do districts whose assessors and assessment reviewers are appointed at more local levels also have budget review agencies with less frequent power to change specific parts of the budget?

Factor 3: Why do budget review agencies that have the power to change the total budget also have fewer other public functions?

Factor 5: What accounts for these four variables appearing together -- master planning, a longer time for budget preparation, a stated policy on local purchases, and open budget hearings? Is it a sensitivity to local conditions?

Factor 6: Why is the inclusion of teachers in budget preparation less frequent in districts where the budget review agency has the power to reject and return the budget? Are the budgets being fashioned for acceptance primarily?

F. Bibliography

Business Services. Education Monograph No. 23, San Diego County Schools, Office of the Superintendent, San Diego, California (undated).

Financial Accounting for Public Schools. U. S. Office of Education, Circular No. 204, Government Publishing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

Fiscal Authority of City School Boards. National Education Association, Research Bulletin 24 (April). Washington, D. C., 1950.

Hutchins, Clayton D. and Munse, Albert R. Public School Financial Programs in the U. S. U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 22, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1955.

Kent, John R. The Administration of Public School Insurance Affairs. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1954.

Knezevich, Stephen J. and Fowlkes, John G. Business Management of Local School Systems. New York: Harper, 1960.

Mort, Paul R., Polley, John W. and Reusser, Walter C. Public School Finance. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

XI. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: ELECTIONS

A. Variables

1. Needs emphasized in campaign: crowded conditions (See also 32 and 39)

   (S-85): During the last election campaign, to what extent did the schools emphasize each of the following:

   a. rising enrollment?
   b. crowded conditions?
   c. salaries need to be increased?
   d. poor condition of buildings and facilities?
   e. rising costs of construction?
   f. quality of instruction?

2. Needs emphasized in campaign: salary increases (See also 33 and 40)

   (S-85): See 1

3. Needs emphasized in campaign: buildings and facilities (See also 34 and 41)

   (S-85): See 1

4. Needs emphasized in campaign: construction costs (See also 35 and 42)

   (S-85): See 1

5. Needs emphasized in campaign: quality of instruction (See also 36 and 43)

   (S-85): See 1

6. Disagreement among school representatives

   (S-86b-e): Among school representatives, to what extent was there any disagreement in the last financial election campaign about these factors:

   b. the amount of the request?
   c. the timing of the election?
   d. the nature of the campaign to be waged?
   e. the value to be stressed in the campaign?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .943
Scalability, items = .837
Scalability, individuals = .667

7. Disagreement on need for proposed request

(S-86a): Among school representatives, to what extent was there any disagreement in the last financial election campaign on the need for the proposed request?

8. Increasing voter registration: use of letters and post cards (S-87a1)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

9. Increasing voter registration: use of telephones (S-87a2)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

10. Increasing voter registration: use of personal contacts (S-87a3)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

11. Speeches in campaign

(S-87a4, 87b4): In your last election campaign did you use speeches to:

a. increase overall voter registration? (50% yes)
b. focus on getting votes of parents of children in school (66% yes)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .962
Scalability, items = .910
Scalability, individuals = .757

12. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of letters and post cards (S-87b1)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

13. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of telephones (S-87b2)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

14. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of personal contacts (S-87b3)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

15. Use of organized personal contacts: focus on favorable voters only (S-87c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

16. Increasing voter turnout: use of letters and post cards (S-87d1)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

17. Increasing voter turnout: use of telephones (S-87d2)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

18. Increasing voter turnout: use of personal contacts (S-87d3)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

19. Campaign: number of endorsements important to (S-88)

20. Campaign: professional consultants (S-89)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

21. Campaign organization

(S-90): Did the district have a campaign organization before the election?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

22. Campaign organization, no. of staff members included (S-90)

23. Needs emphasized in campaign: rising enrollment (See also 31 and 38)

(S-85): See 1

24. Needs emphasized in campaign: extent of emphasis (See also 29, 37 and 44)

(S-85): See 1

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .906
Scalability, items = .708
Scalability, individuals = .662

25. Tax levy restrictions, no. of (S-62)

26. Timing of school financial election: policy on

(S-63): Are you required to hold district financial elections in conjunction with regularly scheduled city, state, or national elections?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

27. Timing of school financial election: date preference (S-63)

(Code: 0--none
1--January
2--February, etc.)

28. Quality of campaign: citizen questions unanswered, no. of instances

(P-11): At the time of the last financial election, were there any instances that you know of when a parent or other citizen had difficulty getting an answer to some question?

29. Needs emphasized in campaign: extent of emphasis (See also 37 and 44)

(P-13): See 24

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .900
Scalability, items = .689
Scalability, individuals = .635

The correlation between S and P assessments (variables 24 and 29) is .22.

The correlation between BP and P assessments (variables 29 and 37) is .17.

The correlation between O and P assessments (variables 29 and 44) is .15.

30. Tax levy extention: duration of

(1F-p.3): Average years duration for election nearest 1950 and the most recent tax election

31. Needs emphasized in campaign: rising enrollment (See also 38)

(BP-48): See 23

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 23 and 31) is .52.

32. Needs emphasized in campaign: crowded conditions (See also 39)

(BP-48): See 1

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 1 and 32) is .33.

33. Needs emphasized in campaign: salary increases (See also 40)

(BP-48): See 2

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 2 and 33) is .50.

34. Needs emphasized in campaign: buildings and facilities (See also 41)

(BP-48): See 3

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 3 and 34) is .26.

35. Needs emphasized in campaign: construction costs (See also 42)

(BP-48): See 4

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 4 and 35) is .00.

36. Needs emphasized in campaign: quality of instruction (See also 43)

(BP-48): See 5

The correlation between S and BP assessments (variables 5 and 36) is .15.

37. Needs emphasized in campaign: extent of emphasis
(See also 29)

(BP-48): See 24

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .899
Scalability, items = .715
Scalability, individuals = .638

The correlation between BP and S assessments (variables 37 and 24) is .15.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 37 and 44) is .02.

38. Needs emphasized in campaign: rising enrollment

(O-5): See 23 and 31

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 23 and 38) is .25.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 31 and 38) is .26.

39. Needs emphasized in campaign: crowded conditions

(O-5): See 1 and 32

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 1 and 39) is .34.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 32 and 39) is .09.

40. Needs emphasized in campaign: salary increases

(O-5): See 2 and 33)

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 2 and 40) is .24.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 33 and 40) is .23.

41. Needs emphasized in campaign: buildings and facilities

(O-5): See 3 and 34

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 3 and 41) is .31.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 34 and 41) is .32.

42. Needs emphasized in campaign: construction costs

(O-5): See 4 and 35

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 4 and 42) is -.10.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 35 and 42) is .06.

43. Needs emphasized in campaign: quality of instruction

(O-5): See 5 and 36

The correlation between S and O assessments (variables 5 and 43) is .16.

The correlation between BP and O assessments (variables 36 and 43) is .13.

44. Needs emphasized in campaign: extent of emphasis

(O-5): See 24, 29 and 37

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .882
Scalability, items = .652
Scalability, individuals = .611

The correlation between O and S assessments (variables 44 and 24) is .12.

45. Needs emphasized in campaign: superintendent-board president understanding

(S-85 and BP-48): Average difference in assessments for items a-f listed under variable 1

B. Data

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
1	119	3.78	4.00	1.40	-.94	-08	-17	-30**	-06
2	111	2.37	2.00	1.55	.45	-16	-08	-25*	30**
3	119	2.94	3.00	1.50	.06	-10	01	-09	-19
4	115	2.48	2.00	1.39	.44	01	-16	-09	-07
5	117	3.32	4.00	1.57	-.52	-24*	-23*	-20	21*
6	119	1.36	1.00	1.36	.58	-21*	-22*	-34***	22*
7	119	1.53	1.00	.79	1.97	-14	-09	-02	04
8	120	.32	.00	.47	.79	03	-13	-16	11
9	120	.42	.00	.49	.30	10	-27**	-24*	16
10	120	.49	.00	.50	.03	12	-12	-10	21
11	119	1.15	1.00	.82	-.28	05	-28*	-11	20
12	119	.51	1.00	.50	-.05	01	-22*	-22*	24*
13	119	.55	1.00	.50	-.19	-07	-21*	-35***	09
14	119	.63	1.00	.48	-.54	02	-21*	-19	22*
15	120	.28	.00	.45	.96	-02	-10	-01	09
16	120	.35	.00	.48	.63	13	-04	-15	11
17	120	.54	1.00	.50	-.17	-05	-25**	-24*	-02
18	120	.46	.00	.50	.17	12	-11	-11	02
19	116	2.53	2.00	1.90	.57	-15	-35***	-19	08
20	121	.11	.00	.31	2.54	-03	-15	-06	16
21	121	.52	1.00	.52	.10	-03	-28**	-20	11
22	68	2.07	2.00	1.89	1.15	-11	-16	-19	04
23	120	4.00	5.00	1.34	-1.28	01	-29**	-13	-14
24	119	3.04	3.00	1.58	.02	-22*	-22*	-26*	-02
25	147	.86	1.00	.83	.76	04	-17*	01	-12

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
26	145	.16	.00	.37	1.87	09	-06	08	-12
27	47	6.68	6.00	3.95	-.22	03	09	18	09
28	121	.15	.00	.88	7.39	-21*	-08	04	30**
29	112	3.36	3.00	1.50	-.16	-03	-23*	-24*	07
30	67	4.25	4.50	2.47	.03	-17	-29*	-39**	08
31	119	4.13	5.00	1.25	-1.36	02	-25**	-21*	-13
32	119	4.16	5.00	1.32	-1.60	01	-23*	-17	-05
33	111	2.29	2.00	1.52	.53	04	05	-08	23*
34	118	3.66	4.00	1.37	-.65	-10	-06	-17	-06
35	115	2.89	3.00	1.43	-.09	-10	07	-22*	04
36	117	3.30	4.00	1.59	-.38	-06	-01	05	15
37	119	2.97	3.00	1.56	-.01	-07	-13	-21*	06
38	110	4.01	5.00	1.39	-1.21	02	-11	01	-13
39	108	3.82	5.00	1.48	-.90	-05	-16	-06	-08
40	103	2.81	3.00	1.51	.16	-06	-15	-12	30**
41	107	2.95	3.00	1.53	.03	-02	-05	-19	-14
42	106	2.48	2.00	1.39	.60	-05	-01	-04	-10
43	107	2.35	2.00	1.32	.57	-09	-14	-02	15
44	110	3.25	3.00	1.52	-.02	-11	-25**	-11	-02
45	112	3.00	2.67	1.96	.60	-01	04	17	06

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6	77		81							
7	78		84							
8	80			85						
9	74			72						
10	76			70						
11	79	61		40						
12	50	48								
13	71	71								
14	79	85								
15	60	41				-47				
16	64			67						
17	68	58		45						
18	66	50		43						
19	59					71				
20	42									41
21	71							42		
22	83							86		
24	48									
25	61									74
27	73				44			-46		
28	49					50				
29	59						68			
30	86	45			-59					
37	51						64			
44	64								78	
45	59				74					

Variables 1-5 and 23, 31-36, and 38-43 were omitted because they are component parts of homogeneous scales (24, 37, and 44, respectively).

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis and scaling analysis, in conjunction with patterns of criterion relationships, permitted us to drop some measures that appear to be redundant to the same variables.

Factor 1 contains six variables with significant criterion relationships. Since only two patterns of relationship were found, we kept only two: variable 12, *Use of letters and* postcards to get out parent vote, and, variable 30, Duration of tax levy extension.

Factor 3 has three variables with significant relationships to criterion variables, but we kept only variable 9, Use of telephones to increase voter registration.

Factor 6 has two variables with significant relationships and similar patterns. We kept variable 29, Extent of emphasis on needs in campaign (P).

Factor 8 also has two variables, significantly related to a criterion, with similar patterns of relationship. We kept variable 24, Extent of emphasis on needs in campaign (S).

Of the six variables in the first scale set (1-5, 23), four had significant relationships. But these were subsumed by using the summary measure (variable 24) and keeping variable 2, Salary increases emphasized in campaign (S).

Of the six variables in the second set (31-36), four also had significant relationships. We kept only variable 33, Salary increases emphasized in campaign (BP). Although it represents another assessment of the same condition, the pattern of relationships is different than for variable 2, which, however, is similar to the pattern for another assessment, by the opposition spokesman (variable 40), and we have used it to represent the latter.

Other variables retained are: variable 6, Disagreement among school representatives in campaign; variable 19, No. of endorsements important to campaign; variable 21, Campaign organization; variable 25, No. of tax levy restrictions; and, variable 28, No. of unanswered citizen questions in campaign.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Do districts that use personal contacts with favorable voters and concentrate on the parent vote feel obliged to also attempt to increase the general turnout of voters?

Factor 3: Do some districts restrict their campaign work simply to increasing voter registration and turnout?

Factor 5: Is it the use of personal contacts among favorable voters that leads to fewer unanswered questions among citizens? Why do districts that use personal contacts tend to feel that fewer important endorsements are necessary?

Factor 7: Why is it that districts with more extensive campaign organizations tend to avoid financial elections at the end of the calendar year?

Factor 9: Does the number of tax levy restrictions in some districts contribute to the need for professional campaign consultation?

F. Bibliography

Carter, Richard F. Voters and Their Schools. Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1960.

Carter, Richard F. and Sutthoff, John. Communities and Their Schools. School of Education. Stanford University, 1960.

Harrington, J. H. "Timing of Elections," School Executive. Vol. 64 (October, 1959).

How Can We Conduct A Winning Campaign? National Citizens Council for Better Schools, Working Guide 3C, New York (undated).

Kindred, Leslie W. School Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

MacConnell, James D. Planning for School Buildings. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Reeder, Ward. Campaigns for School Taxes. New York: Macmillan, 1946.

XII. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: INFORMATION

A. Variables

1. Public meetings: school use of

(S-104): To what extent does the district use public meetings for each of these purposes:

a. present school planning to citizens?
b. discuss teaching methods?
c. discuss curriculum?
d. discuss controversial issues?
e. discuss potentially controversial issues?
f. campaign for school financial issues?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .948
Scalability, items = .830
Scalability, individuals = .774

2. School personnel contacts with public, no. of ways used to increase

(S-105): Has the district taken any measures which are designed to increase face to face contact between staff members and the public? What?

3. Public relations: employment of specialist (S-106)

(Code: 0--none
1--regular consultant
2--staff member
3--both 1 and 2)

4. PR specialist, function of: advise superintendent (S-106a)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

5. PR specialist, function of: advise board of education (S106b)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

6. PR specialist, function of: administer information program (S-106c)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

7. PR specialist, function of: direct financial campaigns (S-106d)

   (Code: 0--no
          1--yes)

8. Increasing voter registration: use of letters and post cards

   (See XI:8)

9. Increasing voter registration: use of telephones

   (See XI:9)

10. Increasing voter registration: use of personal contacts

    (See XI:10)

11. Speeches in campaign

    (See XI:11)

12. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of letters and post cards

    (See XI:12)

13. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of telephones

    (See XI:13)

14. Getting votes of parents with child in school: use of personal contacts

    (See XI:14)

15. Use of organized personal contacts: focus on favorable voters only

    (See XI:15)

16. Increasing voter turnout: use of letters and post cards

    (See XI:16)

17. Increasing voter turnout: use of telephones

    (See XI:17)

18. Increasing voter turnout: use of personal contacts

(See XI:18)

19. PR specialist, function of: orient staff to public relations (S106e)

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

20. Public relations program, extent of

(S-106a-e): See variables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 19

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .975
Scalability, items = .932
Scalability, individuals = .782

21. Information procedures: no. of for facilitating citizen communication with school (S-107)

22. Information procedures: teachers

(T-15): Generally speaking, how good would you say procedures are in this district for answering teacher questions?

23. Information procedures: parents

(P-5): How would you rate the district's procedures for responding to requests for information?

24. School open houses: attendance

(2F-2): Total district attendance at open house or back-to-school functions, per thousand pupils

25. School open houses: activities

(2F-3): Activities included in open house or back-to-school functions

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

a.	tour of physical plant	(83% yes)
b.	demonstration class	(60% yes)
c.	exhibits by pupils	(81% yes)
d.	explanation of curriculum objectives	(78% yes)
e.	explanation of district policies, other than curriculum	(37% yes)
f.	entertainment by pupils	(63% yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .930
Scalability, items = .754
Scalability, individuals = .644

26. Information program, no. of full time personnel assigned to (2F-43)

27. Informational publications, no. of (2F-44)

28. Informational publications, total no. of issues per year (2F-44)

29. Informational publications, no. of for parents (2F-44)

30. Informational publications, no. of for staff (2F-44)

31. Informational publications, no. of for general public (2F-44)

32. Mass media, school use of

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

(2F-45):
a. news releases to media (93% yes)
b. programs produced for radio or TV (61% yes)
c. use of magazines in classroom work (92% yes)
d. use of newspapers in classroom work (89% yes)
e. news conference with media (52% yes)
f. use of educational TV in classroom (53% yes)
g. use of educational radio in classroom (50% yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .912
Scalability, items = .705
Scalability, individuals = .616

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	154	3.29	4.00	1.87	-1.14	-09	-24**	-18	-09
2	153	1.12	1.00	1.27	.28	06	-17*	08	-05
3	153	.47	.00	.84	1.68	04	-24**	-07	-08
4	38	.84	1.00	.36	-1.30	03	04	-10	18
5	38	.58	1.00	.49	-2.56	-14	05	-15	11
6	38	.95	1.00	.22	-.71	-11	06	-05	10
7	37	.60	1.00	.49	-2.48	10	-11	-11	13
19	38	.74	1.00	.44	-1.79	-07	06	-10	07
20	40	3.50	4.00	1.56	-1.78	07	-05	-07	02
21	152	1.07	1.00	1.16	1.46	-10	-14	-12	09
22	152	4.08	4.00	.95	-.71	22**	-08	12	-32**
23	152	4.43	5.00	.98	-1.80	40***	-02	-02	-23*
24	81	687.35	596.00	454.39	.98	-05	-07	08	15
25	123	4.02	4.00	1.84	-.91	-11	-18*	03	01
26	100	6.55	1.00	12.60	3.26	-01	-24*	00	10
27	102	1.59	1.00	1.59	1.20	-04	-25*	-01	19
28	69	17.71	10.00	18.33	1.38	-10	18	07	-04
29	69	.88	1.00	.92	1.11	-10	-11	12	-11
30	69	1.12	1.00	1.43	2.32	-06	-08	30*	-04
31	70	1.01	1.00	.98	1.89	25*	00	12	22
32	123	4.90	5.00	1.73	-.86	00	-20*	-02	-11

C. Factor analysis

		Factors									
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	79				84						
2	61		48								
3	75		44		44						
8	78	75									
9	78	82									
10	82	86									
11	74	68				47					
12	63					51					
13	72					81					
14	71					78					
15	66					44			58		
16	74						-65				
17	77					64		40			
18	59					52					
20	100*			97							
21	56		47								
22	74									83	
23	67							78			
24	82										88
25	65		41		62						
26	68		72								
27	89		77								
28	77		60								
29	80						73				
30	83		77								
31	78								84		
32	74			42							

Variables 4-7 and 19 were omitted because they are parts of a homogeneous scale, variable 20.

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

Five variables with significant relationships to quiescence all appear on Factor 2. We kept only variable 27, No. of informational publications. We also kept another variable from this factor: variable 30, No. of informational publications for staff. It has a significant correlation with acquiescence.

The factor analysis did not aid us in dropping any other variables. Those retained were: variable 1, School use of public meetings; variable 22, Information procedures for teachers; variable 23, Information procedures for parents; variable 31, No. of informational publications for general public; and, variable 32, School use of mass media.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 2: Is the use of informational publications contingent on there being a public relations man on the district staff?

Factor 3: Is the use of mass media by the school -- even in the classroom -- also contingent on there being a district public relations man?

Factor 4: Do some districts have more of an "openness" to the public, as suggested by the correlation between holding public meetings on important issues and the number of open house activities? What kinds of districts have this attribute?

Factor 6: Why is the number of publications for parents negatively related with trying to increase voter turnout at elections by letter or postcard? Is the latter a substitute for the former?

Factor 7: Does the positive correlation between information procedures for parents and increasing election turnout by telephone indicate that the latter is possible only if the former is carried out between elections?

Factor 8: Why is the number of informational publications for the general public related to the use of organized personal contacts to get favorably disposed voters to vote in elections? Is the latter dependent upon the former -- or is it perceived to be necessary by district officials?

F. Bibliography

American Association of School Administrators. Public Relations For America's Schools. 28th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1950.

Carter, Richard F. Voters and Their Schools. Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, 1960.

Kindred, Leslie W., et al. How to Tell The School Story. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

McCloskey, Gordon. Education and Public Understanding. New York: Harper, 1959.

XIII. PARENTS

A. Variables

1. State PTA meetings, parent representation at

   (P-1): To what extent is your local parent group represented at annual state meetings of the Parent-Teacher Association?

2. Parent groups: activities undertaken

   (P-2a-d): Generally speaking, to what extent would you say that your local parent group undertakes each of these activities:

   a. raising money for gifts to the schools?
   b. welcoming new parents into the district?
   c. presenting a public performance by group members, such as a show?
   d. presenting an entirely social program for its members only?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .927
Scalability, items = .773
Scalability, individuals = .713

3. Parent groups: public meetings sponsored

   (P-2e-i): Generally speaking, to what extent would you say that your local parent group undertakes each of these activities:

   e. sponsoring public meetings to present school planning?
   f. sponsoring public meetings to discuss teaching methods?
   g. sponsoring public meetings to discuss curriculum?
   h. sponsoring public meetings to discuss potentially controversial issues in the district?
   i. sponsoring public meetings to discuss controversial issues in the district?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .900
Scalability, items = .679
Scalability, individuals = .653

4. Parent groups, bulletins published by

   (P-3): Does any parent club in the district publish a regular bulletin or report?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Parent-administrator relations (P) (See I:32)

6. Parent-administrator relations (S) (See I:28)

7. Superintendent reaction to parents (See I:33)

8. Teacher reaction to parents (See I:34)

9. Parent-teacher conferences, no. of (See V:3)

10. Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given teachers (See V:4)

11. Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given parents (See V:5)

12. Financial election campaign, participation by parent group (P-12)

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

13. Financial election campaign: type of parent group participation (P-12a)

    (Code: 0--on its own
    1--with schools)

14. Ratio of schools to parent groups (2F-5,1)

15. Ratio of parent group membership to pupils (2F-6,17)

16. Financial election campaign: extent of parent group participation

    (P-12b): Which of these means of participation were used by local parent organizations in the last financial election campaign:

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

endorsement of issues?
telephone canvassing?
door-to-door canvassing?
neighborhood coffee meetings?
transportation service to the polls?
voter registration drive?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .911
Scalability, items = .760
Scalability, individuals = .606

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	141	3.59	4.00	1.58	-.61	00	-31***	-03	-25*
2	148	2.08	2.00	1.08	-.03	05	-08	22*	-18
3	143	2.43	3.00	1.46	.00	-01	-19*	05	01
4	149	.53	1.00	.50	-.12	05	-27*	-10	-11
12	121	.70	1.00	.46	-.89	-09	-22*	-15	01
13	84	.51	1.00	.50	-.05	24*	-10	-04	-07
14	114	1.36	1.04	1.09	3.98	-02	-08	00	40***
15	99	.43	.39	.31	1.94	01	-09	-06	02
16	85	3.81	4.00	1.77	-.44	17	-04	-29*	18

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
1	73		79				
2	65		60				
3	48		67				
4	66	49	44				
5	76						77
6	43				49		
7	63			73			
8	66			76			
9	55	-43				47	
10	78	40			68		
11	82	90					
13	64				77		
14	66					-69	
15	71					80	
16	72						77

Variable 12 was omitted because of artifactual correlation with variables 13 and 16.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis allowed us to drop only one variable. Factor 2 contains four variables with significant criterion relationships, but only two have similar patterns of relationship (3 and 4). We retained variable 4, *Bulletins published by parent groups*.

Other variables kept were: variable 1, *Parent representation at state PTA meetings*; variable 2, *Activities undertaken by parent groups*; variable 12, *Parent group participation in financial election campaign*; variable 13, *Parent group participation with schools in financial election campaign*; variable 14, *Ratio of schools to parent groups*; and, variable 16, *Extent of parent group participation in financial election campaign*. (Although variable 12 is artifactually correlated with variables 13 and 16, it has a different pattern of criterion relationships.)

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 4: Why is the superintendent's assessment of parent-administrator relations related to preparation given teachers for parent-teacher conferences and not to preparation given parents? (Grant found that parent assessments of administrators were improved by preparation given teachers for parent-teacher conferences -- particularly among those teachers he judged more competent in general. See reference in Division V, Section F.) Also, why does parent group participation in the election campaign relate positively to the superintendent's assessment of parent-administrator relations while not to the parent representative's assessment?

Factor 5: Are parent-teacher conferences used primarily as an adjunct to parent groups rather than as a substitute for them? The same districts have more of both.

Factor 6: Why does the parent assessment of parent-administrator relations relate to the extent of parent group participation in financial election campaigns and not to their type of participation?

F. Bibliography

Futter, I. C. Parent-Teacher Relations. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1950.

Gipe, M. W. Parent-Teacher Conferences. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

Homfeld, M. J. A Parent-Teacher Conference Program in the Menlo Park Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.

XIV. PUBLIC: GENERAL

A. Variables

1. Board president contact with public

(BP-2): To what extent do you, personally, get information on how the public feels about the local schools by each of these means?

a. conversations by people outside of board meetings?
c. receiving phone calls from citizens?
d. receiving letters from citizens?
f. meeting with parent organizations?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .910
Scalability, items = .736
Scalability, individuals = .636

2. Board of education contact with public

(B-2 and BP-2): See 1

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .904
Scalability, items = .720
Scalability, individuals = .655

Average scale score for all board members used.

3. Board president reaction to proposed changes from public

(BP-45b-e): If the board receives from a citizen's group a proposal for a change in district policy, to what extent is the board likely to respond in each of the following ways?

b. refer it to a board advisory committee for recommendation?
c. hold a special public meeting to discuss it?
d. discuss it with civic leaders?
e. make an immediate decision?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .900
Scalability, items = .690
Scalability, individuals = .669

4. Board of education reaction to proposed changes from public

(B-3 and BP-45): See 3

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .930
Scalability, items = .744
Scalability, individuals = .738

Average scale score for all board members used.

5. Board action: provision for reporting to public (BP-9)

(Code: 0--none
1--yes)

6. Board meetings: citizen opinions allowed

(BP-13): At a regular board meeting, can a district citizen stand up at any time to give his opinion?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

7. Board meetings: citizen questions allowed

(BP-14): At a regular board meeting, can a district citizen stand up at any time to ask a question for clarification?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

8. Community use of school facilities

(2F-4): No. of uses made by non-school groups of school buildings during the 1960-61 school year.

9. Community use of school facilities: policy on fees (2F-65)

(Code: 0--fee is charged
1--all use is free of charge)

10. Community use of school facilities: permissiveness

(2F-65): Rules on public use of school buildings

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

a. can be used by any group (7% yes)
b. can be used for any purpose (24% yes)
c. can be used at any time, provided no conflict with pupil activities (52% yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .986
Scalability, items = .948
Scalability, individuals = .919

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	154	1.90	2.00	2.09	.16	-13	-20*	-16	-07
2	154	1.79	1.80	.72	.06	-18*	-37***	-18	-02
3	150	2.02	2.00	1.07	.03	01	01	-08	-01
4	154	2.09	2.00	.54	.07	03	-06	-05	09
5	153	.93	1.00	.41	1.72	05	-19*	-15	08
6	153	.63	1.00	.48	-.56	26**	-03	17	-04
7	152	.84	1.00	.37	-1.81	09	-06	08	-22*
8	94	1769.31	120.00	5181.26	5.21	03	-08	00	10
9	123	.13	.00	.34	2.20	14	11	23*	-10
10	123	.83	1.00	.89	.82	-02	21*	-05	07

C. Factor analysis

		Factors			
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4
2	75	84			
4	71				84
5	34			50	
6	72		84		
7	73		82		
8	50	63			
9	41			-48	
10	67			79	

Variables 1 and 3 were omitted as components of 2 and 4, respectively.

D. Variables retained

No variables having the same criterion relationships appear on the same factor. However, variable 1 is a component part of variable 2, with a similar pattern of correlations. So we kept only variable 2, Board contact with public.

The other variables retained were: variable 5, Provision for reporting board action to public; variable 6, Citizen opinions allowed at board meetings; variable 7, Citizen questions allowed at board meetings; variable 9, No fees for community use of school facilities; and, variable 10, Permissiveness on community use of school facilities.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Is there more contact by board members with the public in larger districts? This would appear to be likely, because public use of school facilities was not corrected for size of district, and it appears on the same factor.

Factor 3: Are fees for use of school facilities employed by districts to discourage greater use? The negative correlations of this variable with provision for reporting board actions and permissiveness on use suggest this inference.

F. Bibliography

Kindred, Leslie W. School Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

XV. COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

A. Variables

General characteristics

1. Parochial schools: no. of student services shared with (S-23)

2. Parochial schools: ratio of public school pupils to parochial school pupils (2F-17, 18)

3. Parochial schools: no. of high school graduates (2F-19)

4. Neighborhood characteristics: nationality of origin

   (BP-29): To what extent are there definite neighborhoods in the school district based on each of these characteristics:

   a. nationality of origin?
   b. race?
   c. geographic features?
   d. religion?

5. Neighborhood characteristics: race

   (BP-29): See 4

6. Neighborhood characteristics: geographic features

   (BP-29): See 4

7. Neighborhood characteristics: religion

   (BP-29): See 4

8. Organized efforts to coordinate neighborhoods in the district, no. of (BP-30)

9. Neighborhood factions, extent of

   (S-67): To what extent would you say that neighborhood factions exist in this district?

10. Neighborhood factions: no. of specific rivalries (S-18)

11. Communities within district boundaries, no. of (BP-28)

12. Relationship between communities within the district

    (BP-28a): What kind of a relationship exists between communities in the district?

13. Shared services among communities within district, no. of (BP-29b)

14. Parochial schools: any in district (S-23)

Level of Wealth

15. Per capita income (PCI), 1960 (SM)*

16. Ratio of district PCI to state PCI, 1960

17. Ratio of 1960 PCI to 1950 PCI

18. Ratio of 1950 PCI to 1940 PCI

19. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PCI}}{\text{state PCI}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PCI}}{\text{state PCI}}$

20. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PCI}}{\text{state PCI}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PCI}}{\text{state PCI}}$

21. Per family income (PFI), 1960 (SM)

22. Ratio of district PFI to state PFI, 1960

23. Ratio of 1960 PFI to 1950 PFI

24. Ratio of 1950 PFI to 1940 PFI

25. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PFI}}{\text{state PFI}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PFI}}{\text{state PFI}}$

26. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PFI}}{\text{state PFI}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PFI}}{\text{state PFI}}$

27. Per capita retail sales (PCRS), 1960 (SM)

28. Ratio of district PCRS to state PCRS

29. Ratio of 1960 PCRS to 1950 PCRS

* (SM) designates Sales Management publication as data source. Other data sources in this division are census publications.

30. Ratio of 1950 PCRS to 1940 PCRS

31. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PCRS}}{\text{state PCRS}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PCRS}}{\text{state PCRS}}$

32. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PCRS}}{\text{state PCRS}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PCRS}}{\text{state PCRS}}$

33. Median family income (MFI), 1960

34. Ratio of 1960 MFI to 1950 MFI

Distribution of Wealth

35. Heterogeneity of income (HI), 1960

$$\frac{Q_3 - Q_1}{Q_2}$$

36. Ratio of district HI to state HI, 1960

37. Ratio of 1960 HI to 1950 HI

38. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist HI}}{\text{state HI}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist HI}}{\text{state HI}}$

39. Imbalance toward high income (IHI), 1960

$$\frac{Q_3 - Q_2}{Q_2 - Q_1}$$

40. Ratio of district IHI to state IHI

41. Ratio of 1960 IHI to 1950 IHI

42. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist IHI}}{\text{state IHI}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist IHI}}{\text{state IHI}}$

43. Mean-median income discrepancy (MMID), 1960

44. Ratio of district MMID to state MMID

45. Ratio of 1960 MMID to 1950 MMID

46. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MMID}}{\text{state MMID}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MMID}}{\text{state MMID}}$

Sources of Wealth

47. Percent in agriculture, forestry, fishing (PAFF), 1960

48. Ratio of district PAFF to state PAFF, 1960

49. Ratio of 1960 PAFF to 1950 PAFF

50. Ratio of 1950 PAFF to 1940 PAFF

51. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PAFF}}{\text{state PAFF}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAFF}}{\text{state PAFF}}$

52. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAFF}}{\text{state PAFF}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PAFF}}{\text{state PAFF}}$

53. Percent in mining (PMi), 1960

54. Ratio of district PMi to state PMi

55. Ratio of 1960 PMi to 1950 PMi

56. Ratio of 1950 PMi to 1940 PMi

57. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PMi}}{\text{state PMi}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PMi}}{\text{state PMi}}$

58. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PMi}}{\text{state PMi}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PMi}}{\text{state PMi}}$

59. Percent in manufacturing (PMa), 1960

60. Ratio of district PMa to state PMa

61. Ratio of 1960 PMa to 1950 PMa

62. Ratio of 1950 PMa to 1940 PMa

63. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PMa}}{\text{state PMa}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PMa}}{\text{state PMa}}$

64. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PMa}}{\text{state PMa}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PMa}}{\text{state PMa}}$

65. Percent in services (PS), 1960

66. Ratio of district PS to state PS

67. Ratio of 1960 PS to 1950 PS

68. Ratio of 1950 PS to 1940 PS

69. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PS}}{\text{state PS}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PS}}{\text{state PS}}$

70. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PS}}{\text{state PS}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PS}}{\text{state PS}}$

71. Percent in professions, administration (PPA), 1960

72. Ratio of district PPA to state PPA, 1960

73. Ratio of 1960 PPA to 1950 PPA

74. Ratio of 1950 PPA to 1940 PPA

75. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PPA}}{\text{state PPA}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PPA}}{\text{state PPA}}$

76. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PPA}}{\text{state PPA}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PPA}}{\text{state PPA}}$

Stability of Wealth

77. Reciprocal of percent unemployed (RPU), 1960

78. Ratio of district RPU to state RPU, 1960

79. Ratio of 1960 RPU to 1950 RPU

80. Ratio of 1950 RPU to 1940 RPU

81. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist RPU}}{\text{state RPU}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist RPU}}{\text{state RPU}}$

82. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist RPU}}{\text{state RPU}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist RPU}}{\text{state RPU}}$

83. Ratio of unemployed to employed (U/E), 1960

84. Ratio of district U/E to state U/E, 1960

85. Ratio of 1960 U/E to 1950 U/E

86. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist U/E}}{\text{state U/E}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist U/E}}{\text{state U/E}}$

Stability of Population

87. Reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, same county (RPC), 1960

88. Ratio of district RPC to state RPC, 1960

89. Ratio of 1960 RPC to 1950 RPC

90. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist RPC}}{\text{state RPC}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist RPC}}{\text{state RPC}}$

91. Reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, U. S. and abroad (RPUS&A), 1960

92. Ratio of district RPUS&A to state RPUS&A

93. Ratio of 1960 RPUS&A to 1950 RPUS&A

94. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist RPUS\&A}}{\text{state RPUS\&A}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist RPUS\&A}}{\text{state RPUS\&A}}$

95. Reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, U. S. only (RPUS), 1960

96. Ratio of district RPUS to state RPUS, 1960

Occupational Distribution

97. Percent professional, technical (PPT), 1960

98. Percent managers, officials (except farm) (PMO), 1960

99. Percent clerical, sales (PCS), 1960

100. Percent craftsmen, foremen (PCF), 1960

101. Percent operatives (PO), 1960

102. Percent domestics, laborers (non-farm), 1960 (PDL)

103. Percent farmers, farm managers (PFFm), 1960

104. Percent farm laborers, foremen (PFlF), 1960

105. $\frac{\text{PPT}}{\text{PMO and PCS}}$

106. $\frac{\text{PCF}}{\text{PO and PDL}}$

107. $\frac{\text{PCF}}{\text{PO}}$

108. $\frac{\text{PCF}}{\text{PDL}}$

109. $\frac{\text{PMO}}{\text{PCS}}$

110. $\frac{\text{PFFm}}{\text{PFlF}}$

111. $\frac{\text{PPT, PMO, PCS}}{\text{PCF, PO, PDL}}$

112. $\frac{\text{PPT, PMO, PFFm}}{\text{PCS, PCF, PO, PDL, PFlF}}$

Holding Power of Community

113. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 24\ (60)}{10 - 14\ (50)}$

114. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 29\ (60)}{10 - 19\ (50)}$

115. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 24\ (50)}{10 - 14\ (40)}$

116. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 29\ (50)}{10 - 19\ (40)}$

117. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 24\ (60)}{10 - 14\ (50)}$ to $\frac{20 - 24\ (50)}{10 - 14\ (40)}$

118. Ratio of age groups: $\frac{20 - 29\ (60)}{10 - 19\ (50)}$ to $\frac{20 - 29\ (50)}{10 - 19\ (40)}$

Age Distribution

119. Mean age (MA), 1960

120. Ratio of 1960 MA to 1950 MA

121. Ratio of 1950 MA to 1940 MA

122. Ratio of district MA to state MA

123. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MA}}{\text{state MA}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MA}}{\text{state MA}}$

124. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MA}}{\text{state MA}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist MA}}{\text{state MA}}$

125. Median age (MdA), 1960

126. Ratio of 1960 MdA to 1950 MdA

127. Ratio of 1950 MdA to 1940 MdA

128. Ratio of district MdA to state MdA

129. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MdA}}{\text{state MdA}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MdA}}{\text{state MdA}}$

130. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MdA}}{\text{state MdA}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist MdA}}{\text{state MdA}}$

131. Mean-median age discrepancy (MMA), 1960

132. Ratio of 1960 MMA to 1950 MMA

133. Ratio of 1950 MMA to 1940 MMA

134. Ratio of district MMA to state MMA

135. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MMA}}{\text{state MMA}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MMA}}{\text{state MMA}}$

136. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MMA}}{\text{state MMA}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist MMA}}{\text{state MMA}}$

137. Percent in 5-14 age group (PAG), 1960

138. Ratio of 1960 PAG to 1950 PAG

139. Ratio of 1950 PAG to 1940 PAG

140. Ratio of district PAG to state PAG

141. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PAG}}{\text{state PAG}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAG}}{\text{state PAG}}$

142. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAG}}{\text{state PAG}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PAG}}{\text{state PAG}}$

143. Percent age 21 or over (PAO), 1960

144. Ratio of 1960 PAO to 1950 PAO

145. Ratio of 1950 PAO to 1940 PAO

146. Ratio of district PAO to state PAO

147. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PAO}}{\text{state PAO}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAO}}{\text{state PAO}}$

148. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PAO}}{\text{state PAO}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PAO}}{\text{state PAO}}$

Racial Composition

149. Percent native white (PW), 1960

150. Ratio of 1960 PW to 1950 PW

151. Ratio of 1950 PW to 1940 PW

152. Percent negro (PN), 1960

153. Ratio of 1960 PN to 1950 PN

154. Ratio of 1950 PN to 1940 PN

155. Ratio of district PN to state PN

156. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PN}}{\text{state PN}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PN}}{\text{state PN}}$

157. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PN}}{\text{state PN}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PN}}{\text{state PN}}$

158. Percent non-white (PNW), 1960

159. Ratio of 1960 PNW to 1950 PNW

160. Ratio of 1950 PNW to 1940 PNW

161. Ratio of district PNW to state PNW

162. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PNW}}{\text{state PNW}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PNW}}{\text{state PNW}}$

163. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PNW}}{\text{state PNW}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PNW}}{\text{state PNW}}$

164. Percent white foreign-born (PWF), 1960

165. Ratio of 1960 PWF to 1950 PWF

166. Ratio of 1950 PWF to 1940 PWF

167. Ratio of district PWF to state PWF

168. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PWF}}{\text{state PWF}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PWF}}{\text{state PWF}}$

169. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PWF}}{\text{state PWF}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PWF}}{\text{state PWF}}$

170. Percent foreign-born, all races (PFR), 1960

171. Ratio of 1960 PFR to 1950 PFR

172. Ratio of 1950 PFR to 1940 PFR

173. Ratio of district PFR to state PFR

174. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PFR}}{\text{state PFR}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PFR}}{\text{state PFR}}$

175. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PFR}}{\text{state PFR}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PFR}}{\text{state PFR}}$

176. Percent born in Southern Europe, 1960

177. Percent born in Western Europe, 1960

178. Percent born in Ireland, 1960

179. Percent born in Scandinavia, 1960

180. Percent born in Eastern Europe, 1960

181. Percent born in Latin America, 1960

182. Percent born in Asia, 1960

183. Percent born in Canada, 1960

Size of District Population

184. Percent population increase (PPI), 1950-1960

185. Ratio of district PPI to state PPI

186. Ratio of $\frac{\text{dist PPI 1950-60}}{\text{state PPI 1950-60}}$ to $\frac{\text{dist PPI 1940-50}}{\text{state PPI 1940-50}}$

187. Ratio of PPI, 1950-60 to PPI, 1940-50

188. Percent employed in construction (PEC), 1960

189. Ratio of 1960 PEC to 1950 PEC

190. Ratio of 1950 PEC to 1940 PEC

191. Ratio of $\frac{\text{1960 PEC}}{\text{1950 PEC}}$ to $\frac{\text{1950 PEC}}{\text{1940 PEC}}$

192. Ratio of annexed area in the decade 1950-60 to area in 1950

193. Ratio of 1950-60 area size increase to 1940-50 area size increase

194. Ratio of percent of population in annexed area in 1960 to PPI

195. Percent of population attending school (PAS), 1960

196. Ratio of 1960 PAS to 1950 PAS

197. Ratio of 1950 PAS to 1940 PAS

198. Ratio of $\frac{\text{1960 PAS}}{\text{1950 PAS}}$ to $\frac{\text{1950 PAS}}{\text{1940 PAS}}$

Education

199. Percent of total population with college education (PTPWCE), 1960

200. Ratio of district PTPWCE to state PTPWCE

201. Ratio of 1960 PTPWCE to 1950 PTPWCE

202. Ratio of 1950 PTPWCE to 1940 PTPWCE

203. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PTPWCE}}{\text{state PTPWCE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPWCE}}{\text{state PTPWCE}}$

204. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPWCE}}{\text{state PTPWCE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PTPWCE}}{\text{state PTPWCE}}$

205. Percent of total population with high school education (PTPHSE), 1960

206. Ratio of district PTPHSE to state PTPHSE

207. Ratio of 1960 PTPHSE to 1950 PTPHSE

208. Ratio of 1950 PTPHSE to 1940 PTPHSE

209. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PTPHSE}}{\text{state PTPHSE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPHSE}}{\text{state PTPHSE}}$

210. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPHSE}}{\text{state PTPHSE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PTPHSE}}{\text{state PTPHSE}}$

211. Percent of total population with only grade school education (PTPGSE), 1960

212. Ratio of district PTPGSE to state PTPGSE

213. Ratio of 1960 PTPGSE to 1950 PTPGSE

214. Ratio of 1950 PTPGSE to 1940 PTPGSE

215. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist PTPGSE}}{\text{state PTPGSE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPGSE}}{\text{state PTPGSE}}$

216. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist PTPGSE}}{\text{state PTPGSE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist PTPGSE}}{\text{state PTPGSE}}$

217. Ratio of PTPWCE to PTPHSE, 1960

218. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPHSE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPHSE}}$

219. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPHSE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPHSE}}$

220. Ratio of PTPWCE to PTPGSE, 1960

221. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$

222. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{PTPWCE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$

223. Ratio of PTPHSE to PTPGSE, 1960

224. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{PTPHSE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPHSE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$

225. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{PTPHSE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{PTPHSE}}{\text{PTPGSE}}$

226. Mean educational level (MEL), 1960 (in grades completed)

227. Ratio of district MEL to state MEL

228. Ratio of 1960 MEL to 1950 MEL

229. Ratio of 1950 MEL to 1940 MEL

230. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MEL}}{\text{state MEL}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MEL}}{\text{state MEL}}$

231. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MEL}}{\text{state MEL}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist MEL}}{\text{state MEL}}$

232. Median educational level (MdEL), 1960

233. Ratio of district MdEL to state MdEL

234. Ratio of 1960 MdEL to 1950 MdEL

235. Ratio of 1950 MdEL to 1940 MdEL

236. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist MdEL}}{\text{state MdEL}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MdEL}}{\text{state MdEL}}$

237. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist MdEL}}{\text{state MdEL}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist MdEL}}{\text{state MdEL}}$

238. Mean-median education level discrepancy (M-MEL), 1960

239. Ratio of district M-MEL to state M-MEL

240. Ratio of 1960 M-MEL to 1950 M-MEL

241. Ratio of 1950 M-MEL to 1940 M-MEL

242. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{dist M-MEL}}{\text{state M-MEL}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{dist M-MEL}}{\text{state M-MEL}}$

243. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{dist M-MEL}}{\text{state M-MEL}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{dist M-MEL}}{\text{state M-MEL}}$

Degree of Urbanization

244. Reciprocal of fertility ratio (RFR), 1960

245. Ratio of 1960 RFR to 1950 RFR

246. Ratio of 1950 RFR to 1940 RFR

247. Percent of women in labor force (WLF), 1960

248. Ratio of 1960 WLF to 1950 WLF

249. Ratio of 1950 WLF to 1940 WLF

250. Ratio of non-single family dwelling units (NSFDU), to all dwellings (AD), 1960

251. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{NSFDU}}{\text{AD}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{NSFDU}}{\text{AD}}$

252. Ratio of 1950 $\frac{\text{NSFDU}}{\text{AD}}$ to 1940 $\frac{\text{NSFDU}}{\text{AD}}$

253. Population density (PD), 1960 (no. of persons per square mile)

254. Ratio of 1960 PD to 1950 PD

255. Ratio of 1950 PD to 1940 PD

256. Percent population in urban place (PPUP), 1960

257. Ratio of 1960 PPUP to 1950 PPUP

258. Ratio of 1950 PPUP to 1940 PPUP

259. Percent sales, clerical, kindred (PSCK), 1960

260. Ratio of 1960 PSCK to 1950 PSCK

261. Ratio of 1950 PSCK to 1940 PSCK

Geographic Isolation

262. Rank of isolation index, 1960

    1. Number of multi-lane (3 or more lanes) highways to which the city, town or community has direct access -- either because the highway touches the corporate limits of the community or because the community has an access road to the highway which is not a state or federal highway in itself.
    2. Number of state or federal highways other than multi-lane to which the city, town or community has direct access.
    3. Number of railroads providing the community with passenger service.
    4. Presence or absence of airports with scheduled airline service. An airport was considered "present" if located within 30 miles of the corporate boundaries of the city or town in question.

Scale criteria:
Reproducibility = .980
Scalability, items = .945
Scalability, individuals = .897

263. Higher education: proximity (no. of major institutions in county)

264. Higher education: availability (any institutions in district)

265. Teacher training: proximity (any institutions in county)

266. Teacher training: availability (any institutions in district)

Workers Commuting Outside Community

267. Percent labor force leaving county for work, 1960

268. Percent using auto transportation, 1960

269. Ratio of resident workers to workers in area, 1960

270. Ratio of 1960 $\frac{\text{worker residents}}{\text{in-area workers}}$ to 1950 $\frac{\text{worker residents}}{\text{in-area workers}}$

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	147	1.16	1.00	1.56	2.30	04	09	-08	11
2	68	19.29	14.50	18.00	1.25	08	04	-18	07
3	44	734.50	70.50	1930.03	4.22	-09	-13	17	-02
4	149	1.91	1.00	1.34	1.21	-11	-04	-07	-01
5	149	2.42	2.00	1.55	.55	-12	-11	-14	-01
6	149	2.31	2.00	1.36	.70	-18*	-20*	-21*	10
7	148	1.75	1.00	1.06	1.38	-03	10	-05	14
8	146	.53	.00	1.03	3.43	-07	-07	-01	00
9	153	2.62	3.00	.94	.39	-34***	-20*	-18	-06
10	152	.74	.00	.98	1.45	-18*	-24**	-22*	12
11	144	2.60	2.00	2.11	1.20	-13	-32***	-31**	06
12	80	4.15	4.00	.95	-1.09	25*	01	16	02
13	82	1.84	2.00	1.53	.31	04	02	05	-11
14	147	.66	1.00	.47	-.67	-08	03	-19	08
Level of Wealth									
15	180	1861.00	1933.50	527.15	-.16	-02	-06	-09	19*
16	180	.98	.97	.20	.31	13	-04	-04	25**
17	180	1.52	1.45	.35	1.56	-04	06	06	05
18	180	2.58	2.31	.90	3.57	-05	-05	09	-12
19	180	1.03	.98	.29	2.68	04	10	02	01
20	180	1.07	1.02	.34	4.22	-08	-06	01	-09

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
21	180	6430.13	6601.00	1574.03	.23	-06	-03	-10	28**
22	180	.98	.99	.19	1.91	06	-04	-05	31**
23	180	1.55	1.43	.46	3.40	00	05	08	01
24	180	2.34	2.10	.85	4.41	-08	-05	02	-13
25	180	1.05	.97	.35	3.25	05	09	-01	-05
26	180	1.05	.99	.35	5.37	-14	-03	-03	-04
27	180	1274.65	1177.00	724.23	3.11	18*	-05	-12	-02
28	180	1.04	1.00	.44	.57	22**	-04	-09	-04
29	180	1.52	1.30	1.06	5.91	-11	-04	03	03
30	180	2.85	2.63	1.03	1.91	14	12	18	-20*
31	180	1.11	1.02	.57	5.93	-11	-09	00	09
32	180	1.04	1.02	.34	2.24	04	10	11	-11
33	180	5439.70	5664.50	1684.31	.23	-01	-03	-14	06
34	180	1.89	1.81	.45	4.16	-05	13	04	08
Distribution of Wealth									
35	180	8.59	8.09	2.37	.94	04	08	27**	04
36	180	1.08	.97	.91	8.71	-20*	03	-16	15
37	180	9.29	9.55	2.41	-1.08	-04	-04	-02	11
38	180	1.03	1.01	.22	.83	-08	-05	-05	-04
39	180	12.99	12.32	2.96	1.44	08	08	07	-03
40	180	1.20	1.04	.91	7.83	-15	-04	-18	10
41	180	10.66	9.71	6.41	4.58	-05	-12	-16	02
42	180	1.19	1.01	.81	5.50	-07	-16*	-13	-07
43	180	1063.00	965.50	610.67	4.04	16*	00	09	08
44	180	.93	.85	.51	2.89	27***	-01	20*	11
45	180	1.92	1.64	2.29	3.87	02	-02	07	12

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
46	180	1.01	.95	.79	-1.36	-20*	03	22*	-12
Sources of Wealth									
47	179	7.94	2.61	11.19	1.95	00	28***	20*	-01
48	179	1.07	.52	1.42	2.39	-09	24**	10	10
49	180	.80	.63	.79	3.83	07	-07	08	-01
50	180	.79	.76	.26	1.32	-02	06	-04	-08
51	180	1.45	1.10	1.40	3.88	10	-13	09	-01
52	180	1.14	1.06	.42	1.07	00	00	04	-09
53	179	1.73	.15	6.13	6.08	-02	-12	11	-09
54	180	.95	.32	1.79	3.50	00	12	-06	05
55	180	1.23	.82	1.61	3.62	02	04	-07	-04
56	180	1.11	.78	1.46	4.32	-03	-06	-02	-01
57	180	1.80	1.10	2.42	3.10	-02	10	-15	07
58	178	2.04	1.00	7.61	12.03	04	07	-03	02
59	180	26.04	26.23	13.12	.08	-10	-04	-26**	09
60	180	.96	.99	.42	.32	-04	-16*	-05	-22*
61	180	1.25	1.13	.50	2.65	04	02	18	-16
62	180	1.22	1.10	.40	1.89	-07	-10	12	-03
63	180	1.05	.98	.44	2.47	-02	11	06	-08
64	180	1.17	.98	.73	4.26	-03	-03	09	-05
65	180	36.19	35.46	8.08	.36	12	-21**	05	-14
66	180	.99	.98	.21	.31	14	-16*	-02	05
67	180	1.06	.97	.43	7.38	04	00	10	11
68	180	1.05	1.00	.18	1.30	00	12	20*	-10
69	180	1.06	.99	.41	7.54	02	-04	08	12
70	180	1.01	1.00	.17	.37	-09	14	-01	-01

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
71	180	21.55	20.47	8.80	1.05	09	-01	01	13
72	180	1.02	.97	.35	.87	13	-02	-05	17
73	180	1.43	1.33	.47	3.85	08	07	-03	12
74	180	1.14	1.09	.35	3.53	13	04	19*	01
75	180	1.12	1.02	.35	2.67	05	13	-09	09
76	180	1.01	.97	.31	2.52	10	04	12	04
Stability of Wealth									
77	180	27.81	20.22	59.94	12.50	06	07	01	-04
78	180	3.38	1.07	17.37	10.66	10	00	05	15
79	180	9.51	8.69	6.88	6.15	-14	07	06	03
80	179	32.52	28.87	25.97	3.20	07	02	00	-06
81	180	1.18	1.02	1.17	6.73	-04	-04	04	16
82	179	1.18	1.02	.86	4.80	-04	-01	-11	03
83	180	8.71	9.02	.93	-2.19	-04	-05	-10	05
84	180	.97	.99	.10	-1.79	-03	-13	-04	-02
85	180	.96	.97	.11	-.28	00	-08	06	03
86	180	.97	.98	.11	-.30	-05	-10	-01	07
Stability of Population									
87	180	17.88	16.43	8.58	6.57	-01	08	05	-06
88	180	1.05	.98	.26	1.43	-01	06	-10	02
89	180	2.00	1.88	.60	.63	09	-21**	11	-24*
90	180	1.04	1.03	.22	.81	04	-12	-03	-10

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
91	180	10.36	10.32	2.45	-.49	01	28***	02	15
92	180	1.02	1.00	.17	.94	01	17*	09	00
93	180	1.89	1.89	.45	.57	15	-18*	18	-31*
94	180	1.04	1.02	.17	.78	09	-03	00	-06
95	180	10.60	10.51	2.43	-.53	00	29***	01	-06
96	180	1.02	.99	.16	1.03	01	19*	03	-02
Occupational Distribution									
97	180	11.43	11.15	4.21	.96	08	-09	-08	16
98	180	8.70	8.39	2.88	1.30	21*	-09	02	-05
99	180	21.74	23.62	6.76	-.45	12	-10	-13	-02
100	180	14.27	14.05	3.62	.40	-14	-07	-06	-17
101	180	19.30	18.56	7.38	.78	-13	-05	-05	-09
102	180	17.27	16.82	4.80	.49	07	-03	-01	-08
103	180	4.64	.74	8.17	2.53	-03	18*	14	12
104	176	2.69	1.08	3.82	2.22	-08	16*	22*	10
105	180	.38	.36	.10	1.79	-12	02	03	24**
106	180	.42	.38	.14	.75	-04	01	-02	-01
107	180	.84	.77	.36	1.18	01	03	-01	04
108	180	.91	.83	.39	1.32	-11	00	-05	-08
109	180	.43	.40	.18	1.80	06	04	17	-05
110	180	1.42	.96	1.45	2.55	06	13	06	01
111	180	.88	.83	.47	2.76	13	-06	02	14
112	180	.35	.30	.19	3.11	07	15	09	17

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
Holding Power of Community									
113	177	1.17	.98	.72	1.52	01	-15	04	-19*
114	177	1.19	1.01	.72	1.72	-01	-16	06	-23*
115	177	1.11	1.04	.51	1.19	-02	-13	-01	-19*
116	177	1.12	1.05	.49	.95	-04	-13	-05	-21*
117	176	1.01	.96	.32	1.66	-05	-13	-05	-09
118	176	1.02	.98	.33	1.68	-06	-13	00	-12
Age Distribution									
119	180	31.37	28.16	3.18	-.03	04	10	-17	23*
120	180	.99	.98	.06	.15	-01	05	09	07
121	180	1.01	1.01	.05	-.72	-02	-01	-01	08
122	180	.99	.99	.09	.12	10	04	-14	18
123	180	1.00	1.00	.06	.07	-02	06	-02	13
124	180	1.00	1.00	.05	-.68	-05	-02	-13	14
125	180	28.70	28.50	4.40	.10	04	06	-22*	19*
126	180	.98	.97	.08	.64	-04	02	01	11
127	180	1.03	1.03	.06	.16	-05	04	-04	06
128	180	.99	.98	.13	.71	11	-01	-15	09
129	180	1.01	1.00	.11	4.16	-06	-04	-11	10
130	180	.99	.99	.06	-.16	-05	-01	-12	03
131	176	2.60	2.40	1.94	.72	-02	00	20*	-08
132	180	1.14	1.17	1.53	-2.78	02	02	02	-09
133	179	.76	.79	.63	-5.38	-03	-05	-01	-14
134	180	1.01	.95	.73	.54	-17*	12	05	02
135	179	.96	.97	1.25	-3.86	00	06	07	-05

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
136	180	.97	1.00	.80	-3.80	-06	-03	-05	-12
137	180	20.41	20.15	2.95	.26	-05	-05	15	-14
138	180	1.24	1.26	.16	.00	06	-08	-10	-02
139	180	.97	.95	.09	.78	02	-04	-03	-14
140	180	1.02	1.02	.13	.10	-11	08	12	-14
141	180	1.00	1.00	.12	.59	22**	-04	08	-14
142	180	1.02	1.01	.09	.85	-04	00	-01	01
143	180	58.90	59.42	5.98	-2.35	10	05	-04	19*
144	180	.93	.92	.06	.15	-06	01	06	11
145	180	1.01	1.01	.04	1.36	-07	-02	-12	07
146	180	.99	.99	.07	-.75	08	-06	-12	17
147	180	1.00	1.00	.06	-1.25	-14	01	01	17
148	180	1.00	1.00	.04	.88	-12	-03	-23*	03
Racial Composition									
149	180	82.50	88.36	15.71	-1.64	09	-03	03	02
150	180	1.01	1.01	.09	2.55	-01	00	06	-02
151	180	1.02	1.02	.05	-.26	-01	-11	18	06
152	179	11.87	4.99	15.73	1.80	-02	01	03	01
153	179	1.20	1.00	1.22	5.28	-03	-11	03	-08
154	179	1.34	.99	1.15	3.85	04	00	-12	-12
155	177	1.10	.79	1.41	2.92	01	-10	-04	-01
156	180	.98	.93	.97	5.80	-03	-12	02	-07
157	180	.93	.97	.57	3.63	06	10	-07	-16
158	180	12.87	5.75	15.16	1.75	-04	00	04	01
159	180	1.35	1.05	1.29	5.11	-08	08	00	-12
160	179	1.30	1.01	1.09	5.07	14	05	-18	-05

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
161	179	1.07	.68	1.28	2.53	01	-08	-04	-01
162	180	1.18	1.00	1.31	5.20	-05	04	13	-17
163	180	1.06	.98	.91	6.58	09	06	-08	-14
164	179	4.13	2.53	4.38	1.55	-08	06	-02	03
165	180	.77	.75	.32	1.94	03	-05	-02	-05
166	180	1.17	.79	1.24	4.75	06	05	02	11
167	178	.82	.70	.59	1.36	06	-04	08	04
168	180	.95	.96	.37	1.49	05	00	-11	-03
169	180	1.28	1.01	1.18	5.25	03	05	-10	14
170	177	4.37	2.69	4.58	1.45	-12	04	-01	02
171	168	.60	.54	.46	4.86	08	-04	08	-05
172	165	1.20	.87	1.06	4.76	-04	-06	08	00
173	178	.85	.68	.72	2.83	07	-02	08	01
174	168	.97	.96	.48	2.71	15	02	00	03
175	165	.90	.74	.60	4.23	-08	-08	04	-03
176	117	.13	.11	.10	.96	-20*	15	-03	12
177	124	.32	.31	.13	.47	14	-06	-20	17
178	123	.04	.03	.04	3.11	-08	14	-10	09
179	124	7.85	5.00	10.06	3.57	-15	14	-02	-11
180	124	.18	.16	.12	.85	01	-06	-03	15
181	120	.08	.02	.15	3.44	-05	-11	19	-23*
182	120	.04	.02	.09	8.24	-05	-03	16	-06
183	118	.09	.07	.08	2.15	-02	-08	04	-06
Size of District Population									
184	179	32.80	15.93	61.60	3.04	-07	-06	00	-20*
185	178	4.78	.98	42.36	13.12	04	04	10	-02

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
186	179	1.63	.88	6.13	9.50	-07	-19*	-05	08
187	179	.93	.93	3.34	1.80	-01	-12	-17	20*
188	180	6.54	5.99	3.09	3.27	-05	-04	11	-13
189	180	1.03	.96	.45	3.68	06	06	15	18
190	180	1.47	1.30	.57	2.10	07	07	23*	-17
191	180	.77	.70	.42	3.34	06	05	01	23*
192	174	.59	.00	2.11	5.69	10	-10	26**	-23*
193	107	3.39	.00	18.28	6.93	00	-08	06	01
194	173	2.18	.00	4.55	2.17	24**	-19*	-08	-02
195	180	23.52	23.36	2.86	.18	-03	03	19*	-14
196	180	1.27	1.27	.13	.32	11	-12	-05	-06
197	180	.93	.92	.11	2.65	-04	-10	04	-12
198	180	1.38	1.39	.23	.40	10	-03	-03	02
Education									
199	180	16.23	15.00	7.93	1.12	09	-08	-03	08
200	180	.97	.91	.42	1.59	13	-07	-03	22*
201	180	1.19	1.14	.22	1.81	-10	17*	-02	-02
202	180	1.29	1.23	.32	3.76	-02	-11	-11	01
203	180	.98	.95	.17	1.92	-09	16*	-06	03
204	180	.97	.94	.27	3.06	-05	-12	-07	02
205	180	43.26	45.37	8.99	-.94	00	-03	-15	-12
206	180	.99	1.01	.16	-.99	05	-04	-07	-22*
207	180	1.18	1.14	.16	1.42	-05	09	03	12
208	180	1.28	1.27	.20	.80	-17*	05	-06	07
209	180	1.01	1.00	.13	-1.99	-14	09	-02	01
210	180	1.00	.98	.14	1.19	-13	02	00	-18

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
211	180	40.51	39.06	14.26	.58	-05	07	10	01
212	180	.99	.97	.24	-.10	-13	11	03	-01
213	180	.84	.85	.13	1.98	15	-08	14	09
214	180	.82	.81	.12	.34	03	04	06	-10
215	180	1.01	1.02	.13	.38	11	-06	15	-01
216	180	1.01	1.01	.12	-.57	06	11	-08	03
217	180	.37	.33	.19	2.66	09	-06	00	09
218	180	1.02	1.00	.24	1.79	-04	06	-10	-05
219	180	1.00	1.00	.21	.42	15	-09	06	-01
220	178	.52	.38	.47	2.65	04	-08	01	-01
221	180	1.44	1.35	.48	2.65	-14	13	-03	-04
222	180	1.63	1.56	.63	3.92	-01	-12	00	03
223	180	1.27	1.21	.65	.75	01	-11	-05	-07
224	180	1.44	1.40	.32	1.07	-15	12	-07	-03
225	180	1.64	1.58	.57	5.45	-05	-01	04	00
226	180	10.13	10.30	1.28	-.56	06	-05	-14	03
227	179	1.00	1.01	.09	-.19	10	-07	-10	03
228	180	1.07	1.05	.08	6.32	-08	16	04	-01
229	180	1.09	1.08	.05	.54	-08	-03	00	06
230	180	1.00	.99	.05	1.53	-17*	21**	-03	-12
231	180	1.00	.99	.13	9.14	-04	-01	-07	13
232	180	10.41	10.60	1.55	-.42	04	-12	-10	-03
233	180	.99	1.00	.11	-.18	13	-16*	-05	01
234	180	1.08	1.06	.07	1.10	-04	14	13	-05
235	180	1.12	1.11	.08	.92	-10	-04	-01	-04

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
236	180	.97	.97	.13	-4.29	-13	06	08	-14
237	180	1.00	.99	.08	2.92	-06	-11	-17	06
238	176	-.24	-.30	.88	7.76	03	09	-03	07
239	180	.32	.58	1.77	-2.46	-06	-07	-09	02
240	179	.70	.62	1.95	.12	02	05	06	-16
241	180	.40	.40	2.42	-1.24	01	08	-10	04
242	179	.10	.00	2.73	1.76	-08	-10	10	-15
243	180	.95	.00	6.60	1.50	-07	-10	12	04
Degree of Urbanization									
244	180	1.77	1.75	.26	.19	03	-06	-14	18
245	180	.86	.85	.12	.84	00	04	15	03
246	180	.69	.67	.14	2.59	-18*	02	-03	00
247	180	.34	.35	.07	-.46	10	-04	-16	-07
248	180	1.24	1.18	.20	1.48	-06	19*	15	02
249	180	1.18	1.14	.24	1.08	-01	-14	-05	-10
250	177	.24	.20	.22	1.36	-02	-02	-01	03
251	180	.70	.71	.33	1.34	-08	-12	03	-07
252	180	1.14	1.04	.52	4.29	-10	03	-09	-06
253	176	30.51	14.74	41.48	2.07	-09	-01	-15	01
254	178	1.25	1.00	1.02	5.62	-14	-11	-01	-17
255	178	1.26	1.12	.79	8.02	00	-04	12	-02
256	180	68.04	87.00	37.73	-.73	07	-20*	-13	-13
257	180	.91	1.00	.55	.84	-05	-13	-05	-03
258	180	1.16	1.00	1.26	3.54	-04	-11	-02	06
259	180	21.54	23.48	6.78	-.35	05	-14	-16	06
260	180	1.22	1.16	.28	1.76	-16*	07	-03	04

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
261	180	1.31	1.20	.36	1.44	-11	07	22*	-03
Geographic Isolation									
262	180	2.17	2.00	1.86	1.01	04	-18*	04	-11
263	180	.91	.00	1.25	.82	-08	-25**	00	01
264	180	.13	.00	.34	2.16	06	-13	07	01
265	180	.38	.00	.48	.50	-04	-26**	-01	03
266	180	.17	.00	.37	1.79	02	-14	04	-02
Workers Commuting Outside Community									
267	179	11.83	6.65	13.23	2.06	-02	14	-04	-04
268	179	67.00	69.72	13.23	-1.24	-03	-21**	-12	-12
269	177	2.63	2.09	1.79	2.34	-06	-03	21*	04
270	177	1.14	1.01	.65	7.30	02	-10	07	-21*

C. Factor analyses

General Characteristics

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
1	79				88		
2	78				63		46
3	101*	78		51			
4	75			63			53
5	66			78			
6	63		51			-49	
7	80						89
8	76	42				50	
9	67		80				
10	57		72				
11	56			-60			
12	79					85	
13	88	-79					

* Unstable because of low N.

Variable 14 was omitted because of artifactual correlation with variables 1, 2, and 3.

Level of Wealth

		Factors					
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	85	87					
16	68	77					
17	86		92				
18	90			92			
19	83		91				
20	87			93			
21	84	89					
22	77	78					
23	86		91				
24	93			93			
25	89		93				
26	90			94			
27	78						69
28	84		-40				
29	82				80		
30	88			57			
31	85				81		
32	80			44			
33	86	87					
34	81					88	

Distribution of Wealth

		Factors			
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4
35	44				65
36	94			97	
37	63				75
38	77				84
39	20				
40	98			98	
41	82	81			
42	78	79			
43	80		88		
44	87		92		
45	40	-58			
46	66	-71			

Sources of Wealth

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Factors						
47	86	-41											
48	77		-64										
49	94					91							
50	87											79	
51	94					91							
52	90											77	
53	82								83				
54	70							52	59				
55	88										91		
56	75							84					
57	89										91		
58	83							88					
59	89		72										
60	86		79										
61	92						90						
62	77									70			
63	88						88						
64	83									84			
65	84			86									
66	85			87									
67	89	-51		55									
68	80											-55	
69	88	-50		63									
70	89											-61	
71	87	90											
72	89	92											
73	88												83
74	86				91								
75	86												78
76	86				90								

Stability of Wealth

		Factors		
Variable	h^2	1	2	3
77	14			
78	20			43
79	50			67
80	54		62	
81	57		47	
82	67		81	
83	82	89		
84	81	90		
85	83	91		
86	85	92		

Stability of Population

		Factors			
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4
87	75				76
88	82				87
89	92		89		
90	87			84	
91	92	78	-51		
92	94	96			
93	89		89		
94	89			87	
95	94	79	-51		
96	94	96			

Occupational Distribution

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5
97	96	66				
98	80	84				
99	96	52				
100	90		-44			
101	84	-90				
102	76		-45	-69		
103	97		89			
104	69		48		62	
105	90					93
106	95	51		83		
107	84	82				
108	94			96		
109	87				86	
110	65		79			
111	84	78				
112	94	46	77			

Holding Power of Community

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2
113	88	82	46
114	80	69	56
115	94	97	
116	92	96	
117	90		93
118	92		96

Age Distribution

		Factors					
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6
119	85		84				
120	84	90					
121	72			74			
122	80	43	74				
123	69	79					
124	74			76			
125	90		87				
126	83	80					
127	88			82			
128	79		79				
129	44	54					
130	76			76			
131	80		-64				
132	94					93	
133	90				93		
134	58		-47		45		
135	93					93	
136	90				94		
137	83		-89				
138	78	-79					
139	79						83
140	73		-79				
141	63	-65					-40
142	76						81
143	66		80				
144	84	87					
145	70			71			
146	78		83				
147	68	80					
148	68			76			

Racial Composition

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
149	84		-80										
150	66						57						
151	55										55		
152	96		80										
153	86					83							
154	90				57			73					
155	90		87										
156	84					85							
157	75				80								
158	97		81										
159	88											84	
160	86				89								
161	93		89										
162	86											81	
163	80				85								
164	88	78											
165	93	74					47						
166	91			91									
167	73												
168	86	81											
169	76			80									
170	89	77											
171	54	50											
172	91			92									
173	75	71											
174	85	86											
175	78			84									
176	92										74		
177	81									-62			
178	61								59				
179	90						91						
180	84												75
181	93									88			
182	94							95					
183	80								76				

Size of District Population

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				Factors				
184	78				85			
185	88							93
186	65			79				
187	52			64				
188	87		57		44	56		
189	95		95					
190	84					83		
191	97		92					
192	52				41		56	
193	36						-50	
194	71						79	
195	61	-60						
196	78	55			60			
197	72	-82						
198	90	83			41			

Education

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
							Factors					
199	96	91										
200	92	84										
201	93		43						85			
202	90					90						
203	91								85			
204	89					88						
205	95	70			59							
206	92	60			65							
207	83	-49	61									
208	88			89								
209	87		70									
210	78			84								
211	97	-95										
212	94	-91										
213	84		-74									
214	81	-52		-62								
215	86		-80									

Education, cont.

		Factors										
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
216	81	-42		-70								
217	90	68			-61							
218	85	42							78			
219	60					42						
220	92	85										
221	91		65						65			
222	88			55		66						
223	89	89										
224	93		94									
225	85			85								
226	94	94										
227	74	78										
228	85		76									
229	81			77								
230	76		69									
231	55			44								
232	95	93										
233	90	81									42	
234	82		66							44		
235	82			46			67					
236	82		47							68		
237	81			46			49				53	
238	79	-47										
239	62							-55				
240	57							67				
241	59						-74					
242	62							72				
243	68											79

Degree of Urbanization

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6
244	83			89			
245	82	84					
246	45	56					
247	61	-65		40			
248	48	66					
249	74					81	
250	86	-53		49			
251	80						84
252	46				51		
253	69	-56		51			
254	78		82				
255	74				85		
256	88	-83					
257	76		82				
258	75		58		53		
259	78	-68		44			
260	64	69					
261	61	54					

Geographic Isolation

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2
262	76		87
263	88	50	79
264	89	93	
265	85	44	81
266	90	91	

Workers Commuting Outside Community

Variable	h^2	Factor 1
267	41	64
268	17	41
269	62	78
270	54	74

D. Variables retained

The reports of variables retained are grouped under the same headings used in Sections A, B, and C.

General Characteristics

Factor 2 has three variables that have significant criterion relationships, one of which we dropped as redundant. The two kept were: variable 9, *Extent of neighborhood factions*; and, variable 10, *No. of specific rivalries among neighborhood factions*.

Also kept were: variable 11, *No. of communities within district*; and, variable 12, *Relationship between communities within district*.

Level of wealth

Factor 1 has four variables with similar criterion relationships. We kept only variable 22, *Ratio of district per family income to state per family income, 1960*.

We also kept: variable 27, *1960 per capita retail sales*; variable 28, *Ratio of district per capita retail sales to state per capita retail sales, 1960*; and, variable 30, *Ratio of 1950 per capita retail sales to 1940 per capita retail sales*.

Distribution of Wealth

Factor 2 has two variables with significant, but similar, criterion relationships. We kept variable 44, *Ratio of district mean-median income discrepancy to state mean-median income discrepancy, 1960*.

We also kept: variable 35, *1960 heterogeneity of income*; variable 36, *Ratio of district heterogeneity of income to state heterogeneity of income, 1960*; variable 42, *Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state imbalance toward high income to 1950 ratio*; and, variable 46, *Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state mean-median income discrepancy to 1950 ratio*.

Sources of Wealth

Factor 2 has two variables with significant correlations, but the relationships are dissimilar. We kept both: variable 59, *Percent employed in manufacturing, 1960*; and, variable 60, *Ratio of district percent employed in manufacturing to state* *percent employed in manufacturing, 1960*.

Factor 3 has two variables with similar significant criterion relationships. We kept only variable 65, *Percent employed in services, 1960*.

We also retained: variable 47, *Percent employed in agriculture, forestry, and fishing, 1960*; variable 48, *Ratio of district percent employed in agriculture, forestry, and fishing to state percent, 1960*; variable 68, *Ratio of 1950 percent employed in services to 1940 percent*; and, variable 74, *Ratio of 1950 percent employed in professions and administration to 1940 percent*.

Stability of Wealth

No variables in this subdivision have significant criterion correlations, and we kept none.

Stability of Population

Factor 1 has four variables with similar criterion correlations. We kept only variable 95, *1960 reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, within U. S.*

Factor 2 has the other two variables with significant correlations. These have similar patterns. We kept variable 89, *Ratio of 1960 reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, within county, to 1950 reciprocal*.

Occupational Distribution

The factor analysis did not aid us in this subdivision. We kept all four variables with significant criterion correlations: variable 98, *1960 percent managers and officials*; variable 103, *1960 percent farmers and farm managers*; variable 104, *1960 percent farm laborers and foremen*; and, variable 105, *Ratio of percent professional or technical to percent managers, officials, clerical, and sales, 1960*.

Holding Power of Community

Factor 1 has all four of the variables with significant correlations to a criterion variable. The relationships are similar; we kept only variable 114, *Ratio of 20-29 age group in 1960 to 10-19 age group in 1950*.

Age Distribution

Factor 2 has five variables with significant criterion correlations. Three have distinct patterns; two are redundant to others. We kept: variable 125, *1960 median age*; variable 131, *1960 mean-median age discrepancy*; and, variable 134, *Ratio of district mean-median age discrepancy to state discrepancy, 1960*.

We also kept: variable 141, *Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state percent in 5-14 age group to 1950 ratio*; and, variable 148, *Ratio of 1950 ratio of district to state percent age 21 or over to 1940 ratio*.

Racial Composition

We kept the only two variables with significant criterion correlations: variable 176, *1960 percent born in Southern Europe*; and, variable 181, *1960 percent born in Latin America*.

Size of District Population

The factor analysis did not place any of the variables with similar significant criterion correlations on the same factor. We kept all eight variables with significant relationships: variable 184, *Percent population increase, 1950-1960*; variable 186, *Ratio of 1950-60 district to state percent population increase ratio to 1940-50 district to state ratio*; variable 187, *Ratio of 1950-60 percent population increase to 1940-50 percent population increase*; variable 190, *Ratio of 1950 percent employed in construction to 1940 percent*; variable 191, *Ratio of 1950-60 percent employed in construction ratio to 1940-50 ratio*; variable 192, *Ratio of annexed area in the decade 1950-60 to area in 1950*; variable 194, *Ratio of percent of population in annexed area to percent population increase, 1950-60*; and, variable 195, *1960 percent of population attending school*.

Education

We were able to drop only one variable as redundant. Factor 8 has two variables with similar significant criterion correlations. We kept only variable 201, *Ratio of 1960 percent* of total population with college education to 1950 percent.

We also kept: variable 200, Ratio of district percent of total population with college education to state percent, 1960; variable 206, Ratio of district percent of total population with high school education to state percent, 1960; variable 208, Ratio of 1950 percent of total population with high school education to 1940 percent; variable 230, Ratio of 1960 district to state mean educational level ratio to 1950 district to state ratio; and, variable 233, Ratio of district median educational level to state median level, 1960.

Urbanization

Factor 1 has all five of the variables with significant criterion relationships. However, different patterns of relationships allowed us to drop only two variables as redundant. We kept: variable 246, Ratio of 1950 reciprocal of fertility ratio to 1940 reciprocal of fertility ratio; variable 256, 1960 percent population in urban place; and, variable 261, Ratio of 1950 percent employed in sales, clerical, and kindred to 1940 percent.

Geographic Isolation

Three variables have a significant criterion correlation, but all appear in Factor 2. We retained variable 262, 1960 rank on isolation index.

Workers Commuting Outside Community

Although three variables with significant criterion relationships are on the same factor, there are different patterns of correlation. We kept all three: variable 268, 1960 percent using auto transportation; variable 269, 1960 ratio of resident workers to workers in area; and, variable 270, Ratio of 1960 ratio of resident workers to workers in area to 1950 ratio.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

We did not view the factor analysis results for their implications of relationships within the subdivisions.

F. Bibliography

Data Sources

American Universities and Colleges. (ed. Mary Irwin) Washington: American Council on Education, 1960.

Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1962.

"Survey of Buying Power." Sales Management. New York: Bill Bros. Publishing Corp., April 10, 1941.

"Survey of Buying Power." Sales Management. New York: Bill Bros. Publishing Corp., May 10, 1951.

"Survey of Buying Power." Sales Management. New York: Bill Bros. Publishing Corp., May 10, 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Areas of the United States: 1940. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1942.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Manufacturers: 1954. Vol. 3, Area Statistics. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1957.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Business: 1954. Vol. 2, Area Statistics--Retail Trade. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1957.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Manufacturers: 1958. Vol. 3, Area Statistics. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1940. Vol. 2, Characteristics of the Population. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1943.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. 2, Characteristics of the Population. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1960. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population. Part A, Number of Inhabitants. United States Summary. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1960. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population. Part A, Number of Inhabitants, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Housing: 1950*. Vol. 1, *General Characteristics*: Parts 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Housing: 1940*. Vol. 1, *General Characteristics*, Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1943.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Geographic Reports*. Land Area and Population of Incorporated Places of 2,500 or More: April 1, 1950. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Population: 1960*. *General Population Characteristics*. Final Report. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Population: 1960*. *General Social and Economic Characteristics*. Final Report. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Business: 1948*. Vol. 3, *Retail Trade -- Area Statistics*. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Business: 1958*. Vol. 2, *Retail Trade -- Area Statistics*: Parts I and II. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Housing: 1960*. Vol. 1, *States and Small Areas*. Final Report. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Manufacturers: 1948*. Vol. 3, *Statistics by States*. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1950.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Business: 1948*. Vol. 5, *Wholesale Trade -- Area Statistics*. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Business: 1954*. Vol. 4, *Wholesale Trade -- Area Statistics*. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1957.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *U. S. Census of Business: 1958*. Vol. 4, *Wholesale Trade -- Area Statistics*. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

Level of Wealth

Bowman, M. J. and G. L. Bach. *Economic Analysis and Public Policy*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946.

Garvy, George. "Introduction," *Appraisal of the 1950 Census Income Data*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Grove, Ernest. "Size Distribution of Farm Income," *Appraisal of the 1950 Census Income Data*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Haber, William, Eugene C. McKean, and Harold C. Taylor. *The Michigan Economy: Its Potentials and Problems*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1959.

Johnson, D. Gale. "Appraisal of the Data for Farm Families," *Appraisal of the 1950 Census Income Data*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Leven, Maurice. *Income in the Various States*. New York: Wiley, 1955.

Mansfield, Edwin. "Comment," *Appraisal of the 1950 Census Income Data*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

McKenna, Joseph P. *Aggregate Economic Analysis*. New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

Miller, Herman P. *Income of the American People*. New York: Wiley, 1955.

Distribution of Wealth

Baerwald, Friedrich. *Economic System Analysis*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1960.

Bowman, Mary Jean. "Graphical Analysis of Personal Income Distribution in the United States," *Readings in the Theory of Income Distribution*. Philadelphia: Blakiston, 1946.

Kuznets, Simon. *National Income: A Summary of Findings*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1946.

Miller, Herman P. *Income of the American People*. New York: Wiley, 1955.

Stability of Population

Lee, E. S., A. N. Miller, C. P. Brainerd, and R. A. Easterlin. *Population Redistribution and Economic Growth, U. S. 1870-1950*. Philadelphia: Am. Phil. Soc., 1957.

Schnore, L. F. "Social Mobility in Demographic Perspective," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (June, 1961).

Degree of Urbanization

Anderson, Nels. "Urbanism and Urbanization," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 65 (1959).

Anderson, R. R., and J. A. Egeland. "Spatial Aspect of Social Area Analysis," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26 (1961).

Carter, Richard F. *Community Characteristics and Educational Support*. Mimeographed report, Stanford University, 1959.

Davis, Kingsley. *Human Society*. New York: Macmillan, 1956.

Duncan, O. D. Review of *Social Area Analysis* in *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 61 (1955).

Duncan, O. D., *et al*. *Metropolis and Nation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1960.

Jonassen, C. T. "Functional Unities in 88 Community Systems," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1961).

Shevky, Eshref, and W. Bell. *Social Area Analysis*. Stanford, California: Soc. Series No. 1, Stanford University Press, 1955.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 44 (1938).

4

XVI. VOTER CHARACTERISTICS: PARTICIPATION

A. Variables

1. Major social event to which parents invited (S-83)

   (Code: 1--athletic
   2--dance
   3--banquet, non-athletic focus
   4--open house
   5--graduation)

2. Board meetings: average no. of citizens attending (BP-6)

3. Board meetings: no. of special interest groups attending (BP-7)

4. Board meetings: publication of agenda (BP-8)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Citizen knowledge of school needs (See also 7)

   (BP-24): How good would you say the local citizens' understanding is of these needs of the district:

   a. school building needs?
   b. special service needs?
   c. operational needs?
   d. personnel needs?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .977
Scalability, items = .926
Scalability, individuals = .885

6. Citizen participation in school activities: superintendent's reaction to

   (P-8): How favorable a reaction would you expect to get from the district superintendent if a parent group asked for more participation in school matters?

7. Citizen knowledge of school needs

   (P-10): See 5.

   The correlation between BP and P assessments (variables 5 and 7) is .08.

8. Board meetings: media attendance permitted (M-1)

(Code: 0--attendance not permitted
1--attendance permitted)

9. Board meetings: media coverage without reporting

(M-2): Are there any meetings of the district board of education which the mass media can cover but are not allowed to report?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

10. Citizen participation in policy determination, no. of opportunities for

(P-9): What specific opportunities now exist for parent groups to participate in determining school policies?

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	154	3.24	4.00	1.44	-.80	01	-10	-01	-21*
2	144	17.31	5.00	64.68	10.47	-06	-09	05	-05
3	152	1.40	1.00	1.73	1.32	-17*	-28***	-14	08
4	152	.26	.00	.44	1.08	-13	-17*	-08	04
5	152	2.07	2.00	1.37	.00	18*	-07	15	00
6	151	4.24	5.00	1.03	-1.37	12	-09	-03	-03
7	152	1.89	2.00	1.41	.04	30***	-05	05	-13
8	132	.70	1.00	.46	-.86	17	-01	22*	-03
9	132	.20	.00	.40	1.46	-10	-12	-08	-13
10	124	2.56	3.00	2.54	.18	16	00	15	-16

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5
1	68			77		
2	57	46	54			
3	74	83				
4	49	61				
5	72					80
6	79				87	
7	63		50		52	
8	69	-40				70
9	47			64		
10	69		-76			

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 has two variables with similar patterns of relationship to the criterion variables, although the correlations are larger for one -- with two correlations significant rather than one. We kept only variable 3, No. of special interest groups attending board meetings.

Otherwise, the factor analysis did not yield any reductions. We also retained: variable 1, Major social event to which parents invited; variable 5, Citizen knowledge of school needs (BP); variable 7, Citizen knowledge of school needs (P); and, variable 8, Board meetings: media attendance permitted.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Is attendance at board meetings by citizens or citizen groups increased when the mass media are not allowed to attend? We might expect media coverage to arouse citizen interest -- and attendance.

Factor 2: Does citizen attendance at board meetings lead to greater knowledge of school needs -- or only a perception that it does? Also, do citizens go to board meetings when other means of participating in school policy determination are closed to them?

Factor 4: Why does the parent view of citizen knowledge of school needs relate to his expectation of a favorable reaction from the superintendent if the latter were asked for more parent participation?

Factor 5: Why is the board president's view of citizen knowledge of school needs related to media attendance being permitted at board meetings? Is this his expectation of what should be the case?

F. Bibliography

Carter, Richard F. Voters and Their Schools. Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1960.

Citizen Co-operation for Better Public Schools. 53rd Yearbook, I, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Savard, William G. Voter Turnout in School Financial Elections. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1961.

Trusty, Francis M. Perceived Factors in the School-Community Relationship and School Financial Support. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1960.

XVII. VOTER CHARACTERISTICS: CRITICS

A. Variables

1. Criticism on meeting community needs (lack of)

   (0-1): Do you feel that the schools in this district are producing pupils who fit the needs of their local community?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

2. Criticism on curricular emphasis

   (0-2): In your opinion, is undue emphasis being placed on any part of the local district curriculum?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

3. Individual criticism of what is taught (See also 42)

   (0-3): In your opinion, to what extent is each of the following being criticized by citizens of this district:

   a. what is being taught?
   b. how things are being taught?
   c. student performance?
   d. administration of the schools?
   e. teacher capability?
   f. school expenditures?
   g. the level of taxes?
   h. board of education members?

4. Individual criticism of how subjects are taught (See also 43)

   (0-3): See 3

5. Individual criticism of student performance (See also 44)

   (0-3): See 3

6. Individual criticism of school administration (See also 45)

   (0-3): See 3

7. Individual criticism of teacher capability (See also 46)

   (0-3): See 3

8. Individual criticism of expenditures (See also 47)

   (0-3): See 3

9. Individual criticism of tax level (See also 48)

   (0-3): See 3

10. Individual criticism of schools: extent of (See also 49)

    (0-3a-d, f): See 3, 4, 5, 6, 8

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .910
Scalability, items = .726
Scalability, individuals = .640

11. Individual criticism of board members

    (0-3): See 3

12. No. of organized critic groups (See also 35 and 50) (0-4)

13. Individual opposition use of newspaper advertisements

    (0-7): To what extent did citizens acting as individuals make use of the following ways of presenting their opposition to the schools:

    a. newspaper advertisements?
    b. public meetings?
    c. discussions on radio or television?
    d. news conferences or news releases?
    e. letters to newspapers?

14. Individual opposition use of public meetings

    (0-7): See 13

15. Individual opposition use of radio/TV discussions

    (0-7): See 13

16. Individual opposition use of news conferences/releases

    (0-7): See 13

17. Individual opposition use of letters to newspapers

(0-7): See 13

18. Organized opposition in last financial election (lack of) (0-6)

(Code: 0--yes
1--no)

19. Published bulletin/reports by opposition to schools (lack of) (0-6)

(Code: 0--yes
1--no)

20. Organized opposition use of newspaper ads

(0-6): To what extent did opposition groups make use of the following ways of presenting their position:

a. newspaper advertisements?
b. radio advertisements?
c. television advertisements?
d. public meetings?
e. discussions on radio or television?
f. news conferences or news releases?
g. letters to newspapers?

21. Organized opposition use of radio ads

(0-6): See 20

22. Organized opposition use of television ads

(0-6): See 20

23. Organized opposition use of public meetings

(0-6): See 20

24. Organized opposition use of radio/TV discussions

(0-6): See 20

25. Organized opposition use of news conferences/releases

(0-6): See 20

26. Organized opposition use of letters to newspapers

(0-6): See 20

27. Extent of mass media use by organized opposition

(0-6b-f): See 21-25

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .931
Scalability, items = .810
Scalability, individuals = .676

28. Extent of mass media use by individual opposition

(0-7a-e): See 13-17

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .958
Scalability, items = .835
Scalability, individuals = .747

29. Conservative elements in district

(S-77): To what extent is each of these types of conservative opinion evident among citizens in this district:

a. traditional conservatism?
b. economic conservatism?
c. political conservatism?
d. religious conservatism?
e. reactionary conservatism?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .928
Scalability, items = .791
Scalability, individuals = .661

30. Conservative elements: traditional

(S-77): See 29

31. Conservative elements: economic

(S-77): See 29

32. Conservative elements: political

(S-77): See 29

33. Conservative elements: religious

(S-77): See 29

34. Conservative elements: reactionary

(S-77): See 29

35. No. of organized critic groups

(S-79): Is there any organized opposition to school policies in the district -- such as from taxpayer groups or apartment owner groups?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

The correlation between O and S reports (variables 12 and 35) is .34.

36. Organized opposition techniques used in last financial election: extent of

(S-91): Were any of these techniques used by organized opposition to the last financial election:

a. last minute attacks?
b. attacks on personalities?
c. endorsements by leading citizens?
d. bringing irrelevant issues into the campaign?
e. letters to the newspaper?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .950
Scalability, items = .836
Scalability, individuals = .609

37. Organized opposition use of last minute attacks

(S-91): See 36

38. Organized opposition use of personality attacks

(S-91): See 36

39. Organized opposition use of endorsements

(S-91): See 36

40. Organized opposition use of irrelevant issues

(S-91): See 36

41. Organized opposition use of letters to newspapers

(S-91): See 36

42. Individual criticism of what is taught

(BP-22a): See 3

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 3 and 42) is .16.

43. Individual criticism of how subjects are taught

(BP-22b): See 4

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 4 and 43) is .25.

44. Individual criticism of student performance

(BP-22c): See 5

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 5 and 44) is .11.

45. Individual criticism of school administration

(BP-22d): See 6

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 6 and 45) is .24.

46. Individual criticism of teacher capability

(BP-22e): See 7

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 7 and 46) is .11.

47. Individual criticism of expenditures

(BP-22f): See 8

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 8 and 47) is .37.

48. Individual criticism of tax level

(BP-22g): See 9

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 9 and 48) is .35.

49. Individual criticism of schools: extent of

(BP-22a-d, f): See 42-45, 47

Scale criteria:
Reproducibility = .928
Scalability, items = .748
Scalability, individuals = .700

The correlation between O and BP assessments (variables 10 and 49) is .29.

50. No. of organized critic groups

(BP-23): See 12

The correlation between BP and O reports (variables 12 and 50) is .40.

The correlation between BP and S reports (variables 35 and 50) is .36.

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	143	.57	1.00	.50	-.27	28**	06	-07	01
2	142	.61	1.00	.49	-.43	16	09	02	02
3	144	2.67	3.00	1.04	.33	-11	-02	-01	-05
4	145	2.75	3.00	1.20	.30	-14	-02	09	08
5	145	2.73	3.00	1.12	.37	-10	01	01	-05
6	144	3.26	3.00	1.36	-.16	-38***	-09	-12	-10
7	145	2.72	3.00	1.11	.33	-10	03	06	02
8	146	3.32	4.00	1.43	-.23	-34***	-13	-28**	08
9	144	3.26	3.00	1.38	-.16	-31***	-11	-41***	19
10	146	2.32	2.00	1.43	.15	-31***	-07	-07	-07
11	144	2.94	3.00	1.31	.13	-36***	-08	-29**	08
12	142	1.25	1.00	1.60	1.87	-12	-16	-02	06
13	87	1.36	1.00	.87	2.69	-19	-08	-17	18
14	86	1.78	1.00	1.29	1.56	-21	-11	-27*	02
15	85	1.26	1.00	.69	3.29	-06	-23*	13	16
16	86	1.45	1.00	.98	2.22	-15	-07	-09	18
17	85	2.45	2.00	1.34	.49	-27*	03	-19	07
18	116	.78	1.00	.41	-1.38	13	11	28**	-16
19	19	.53	1.00	.50	-.10	15	-12	-08	-30
20	18	3.06	3.50	1.62	-.09	-38	-27	-31	31
21	17	1.88	1.00	1.23	1.17	-29	-36	-18	49
22	16	1.12	1.00	.48	3.62	17	04	13	-07
23	17	2.88	2.00	1.74	.18	-40	-12	-13	-60*
24	17	1.94	1.00	1.16	.56	-25	-51*	-09	31
25	18	2.39	2.50	1.34	.52	18	05	16	21

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
26	18	3.00	3.00	1.63	-.08	-35	26	43	07
27	17	2.06	2.00	1.39	.68	-21	-23	-14	14
28	86	1.57	1.00	1.53	.78	-23*	-12	-17	16
29	149	2.39	3.00	1.60	.04	01	08	13	-10
30	151	3.16	3.00	.94	.06	01	05	05	-01
31	151	3.32	3.00	.85	-.07	-15	05	-03	-02
32	151	3.03	3.00	.93	.05	07	01	10	-09
33	150	2.83	3.00	.98	.14	05	14	30**	-03
34	151	2.20	2.00	.86	1.04	-10	03	02	-23*
35	152	.22	.00	.41	1.37	-20*	-16	-26*	12
36	61	1.85	1.00	1.73	.52	-25	-13	-47**	17
37	63	.41	.00	.49	.36	-30*	-07	-44**	23
38	63	.29	.00	.45	.95	-22	-13	-36*	05
39	62	.21	.00	.41	1.43	-13	10	-06	07
40	63	.36	.00	.48	.56	-17	-25*	-30*	17
41	63	.59	1.00	.49	-.36	-30*	-37**	-44**	15
42	153	2.17	2.00	.80	.38	-20*	-18*	-09	21*
43	153	2.22	2.00	.75	.72	-19*	-20*	-13	17
44	153	2.21	2.00	.85	.34	-25**	-17*	-12	13
45	153	2.29	2.00	.88	.98	-39***	-11	-10	31**
46	153	2.35	2.00	.85	.61	-26**	-12	01	22*
47	152	2.50	2.00	1.02	.60	-23**	-19*	-36***	27**
48	150	3.03	3.00	1.25	.02	-19*	-28***	-44***	19
49	153	2.25	2.00	1.44	.36	-26***	-24**	-26*	27**
50	151	1.23	1.00	1.48	1.05	-16	-22**	-19	22*

C. Factor analysis

		Factors							
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	78						-45	40	
2	64			-40		45			
7	86			54	-57	43			
9	62								
10	72			78					
11	72			75					
12	68		78						
14	70	79							
19	98				93				
23	107*	91							
27	100*	49	56						59
28	76	81							
29	80								87
35	61		65						
36	76					-81			
46	63						78		
48	96							89	
49	80						81		
50	71		78						

Variables 3-6, 8, 13, 15-17, 21-22, 24-25, 30-34, 37-45, and 47 were omitted because they are components of scales.

Variables 20 and 26 were omitted because of low N.

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis did not furnish us any evidence for dropping redundant variables. However, a large number of variables were not included in the factor analysis because we had scaled sets of them and put only the total scores into the factor analysis. An examination of criterion relationships among scalable sets allowed us to drop nine of the variables with significant criterion relationships in Section B.

Variable 17, Individual opposition use of letters to newspapers, was taken to represent variable 28.

Variable 37, *Organized opposition use of last minute attacks*, and variable 41, *Organized opposition use of letters to newspapers*, were taken to represent variables 36, 38, and 40.

Variable 49, *Extent of individual criticism of schools (BP)*, was taken to represent variables 42 through 45, and variable 47.

We also kept: variable 1, *Lack of criticism on meeting community needs*; variable 6, *Individual criticism of school administration (O)*; variable 8, *Individual criticism of expenditures (O)*; variable 9, *Individual criticism of tax level (O)*; variable 11, *Individual criticism of board (O)*; variable 14, *Individual opposition use of public meetings*; variable 15, *Individual opposition use of radio/TV discussions*; variable 18, *Lack of organized opposition in last financial election*; variable 23, *Organized opposition use of public meetings*; variable 24, *Organized opposition use of radio/TV discussions*; variable 33, *Conservative elements: religious*; variable 34, *Conservative elements: reactionary*; variable 35, *No. of organized critic groups (S)*; variable 46, *Individual criticism of teacher capability (BP)*; variable 48, *Individual criticism of tax level (BP)*; and, variable 50, *No. of organized critic groups (BP)*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Why does use of public meetings go with use of mass media for both individual and organized opposition?

Factor 3: Does individual critic focus on teachers and board members occur only at high levels of critical attack on schools? Because these two foci of criticism did not scale with the others, they could not be considered an invariant part of high attack levels. Are these potentially dangerous areas of criticism for the opposition?

Factor 4: Since criticism of teachers seems to occur when reports or bulletins are published by the opposition, do the latter constitute an extreme form of attack on the schools?

Factor 5: Is an opposition attack on curriculum emphases "safer ground"? The superintendent's assessment of the extent of opposition techniques relates negatively with criticism on teachers but positively with curriculum criticism.

Factor 6: Does the schools' ability to meet community needs hold down individual critics -- particularly those focusing on teachers?

Factor 7: Does the schools' ability to meet community needs inevitably bring out more criticism of the tax level?

Factor 8: Given that the extent of organized opposition use of mass media correlates with the extent of conservative elements in school districts, can we infer that opposition use of the mass media is aimed at evoking response from these elements?

F. Bibliography

Kindred, Leslie W. School Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

McCloskey, Gordon. Education and Public Understanding. New York: Harper, 1959.

Moehlman, Arthur B. and Van Zwoll, James. School Public Relations. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

XVIII. VOTER CHARACTERISTICS: VALUES

A. Variables

1. Citizen pride in community, extent of

   (BP-25, 26a-c): Generally speaking, to what extent does the average citizen in this district take pride in his community?

   More specifically, to what extent has there been organized activity by citizens in the district in each of these ways:

   a. beautifying the community?
   b. emphasis on local history?
   c. entering contests for civic recognition?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .925
Scalability, items = .785
Scalability, individuals = .697

2. Citizen pride in community: education

   (BP-27): What are some of the things that visitors are usually told about as those things local citizens are proud of?

   (Code: 0--not mentioned
   1--mentioned)

3. Citizen pride in community: scenery, recreation, climate, location

   (BP-27): See 2

4. Citizen pride in community: business, government, churches

   (BP-27): See 2

5. Citizen pride in community: improvement of historical buildings, history of town, public spirit

   (BP-27): See 2

6. Citizen pride in schools

   (BP-39, 40a-d): In your opinion, to what extent does the average citizen take pride in the district schools?

   More specifically, to what extent has there been civic pride evidenced in the schools by each of these:

   a. beautifying the buildings and grounds?
   b. award banquets for students?
   c. formal recognition of staff members?
   d. donations to the schools?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .904
Scalability, items = .708
Scalability, individuals = .625

7. Optimistic citizen attitude toward business outlook

   (M-14): How did your last month's local commercial advertising revenue compare with that for the same month last year?

8. Optimistic citizen attitude toward business outlook

   (M-14): Ratio of 1962 actual commercial advertising revenue to 1961 revenue

9. Citizen attitude toward taxes: percent of non-school elections that pass (2F-26)

10. Citizen attitude toward taxes: average percent voting yes in non-school elections (2F-26)

B. Data

				Standard		Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
1	154	2.10	2.00	1.20	-.11	24**	-02	11	-06
2	150	.69	1.00	.46	-.80	12	-04	15	-05
3	151	.60	1.00	.49	-.39	08	-02	-01	-06
4	150	.56	1.00	.50	-.24	11	03	07	-17
5	151	.52	1.00	.50	-.09	-03	10	-04	-02
6	150	2.44	3.00	1.38	-.16	30***	-07	13	-06
7	69	3.88	4.00	.84	-.21	-18	04	-17	07
8	59	1.11	1.09	.14	.44	-28*	05	-07	09
9	24	75.12	99.00	32.42	-1.10	-28	20	19	-30
10	22	61.54	64.50	18.78	-1.24	-21	-11	09	-26

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5
1	68			79		
2	80	-83				
3	36				50	
4	76					83
5	74				80	
6	68			80		
7	78		87			
8	75		81			
9	82	72				
10	63	64				

D. Variables retained

Only three variables have significant criterion correlations. The factor analysis allowed us to drop one of these. Factor 3 has two with similar criterion relationship patterns. We kept variable 6, *Citizen pride in schools*.

The other variable retained was variable 8, *Optimistic citizen attitude toward business outlook*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Why do districts that have higher percentages of voters voting "yes" in non-school elections -- and winning more elections -- tend not to promote education as an aspect of the community in which they are particularly proud?

Factor 4: Does the evidence that districts with civic pride in physical attributes of the community also have civic pride in their history represent a "closed view" toward educational progress?

F. Bibliography

McPhee, Roderick F. "Individual Values, Educational Viewpoint, And Local School Approval." *Administrator's Notebook*. Vol. 7, No. 8 (1959).

XIX. COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP: INDIVIDUALS

A. Variables

1. Business leaders: informal advice on school policy

    (S-14e): To what extent is informal advice on school policy given the district by representatives of business and industry?

2. Business leaders: representation on school board

    (S-75d): Are formal representatives of business organizations presently members of the district board of control?

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

3. Large taxpayers: representation on board

    (S-76): Would you tell us, for any large taxpayers, whether they are associated with the district in any of these ways:

    a. as a board member now
    b. as an informal advisor
    c. as a member of formal advisory board
    d. as a philanthropist
    e. as absentee landlord
    f. as an opponent of school policies

    (Code is the number of large taxpayers in each category)

4. Large taxpayers: as informal advisors

    (S-76): See 3b

5. Large taxpayers: as formal advisors

    (S-76): See 3c

6. Large taxpayers: as philanthropists

    (S-76): See 3d

7. Large taxpayers: as absentee landlords

    (S-76): See 3e

8. Large taxpayers: opposition to school policy

   (S-76): See 3f

9. Business leaders: opposition to school policy

   (S-78b): To what extent is opposition to school policies to be found among representatives of business organizations?

10. Civic officials: informal advice on school policy

    (S-14d): To what extent is informal advice on school policy given the district by city officials?

11. Mass media executives, no. of as community leaders (S-101)

12. Civic officials: support on school issues

    (BP-36): What actions related to school issues has a local civic official or group of officials taken in recent years?

    a. support given financial issues
    b. support given non-financial issues
    c. interest expressed in school matters

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .999
Scalability, items = .999
Scalability, individuals = .999

13. Civic officials: opposition to school policy

    (S-78c): To what extent is opposition to school policies to be found among civic officials?

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	149	2.76	3.00	.85	.27	13	-24***	-06	-10
2	144	.31	.00	.46	.81	-01	-03	-04	14
3	135	.27	.00	.72	4.56	13	12	-02	28**
4	135	.87	.00	1.53	1.74	-13	-21*	11	01
5	134	.24	.00	.74	3.54	06	-17	10	-04
6	135	.48	.00	1.03	2.86	-08	-16	19	03
7	135	.34	.00	.96	3.30	-19*	06	-03	-02
8	134	.10	.00	.33	3.19	-20*	00	12	16
9	152	1.88	2.00	.85	3.80	-10	-09	-23*	14
10	146	2.57	2.00	.92	.43	-01	-04	-03	-09
11	144	.94	.00	1.21	1.20	14	-13	-01	-06
12	148	.62	.00	.85	.82	09	-26**	-05	02
13	152	1.75	2.00	.64	.13	-11	06	-17	16

C. Factor analysis

		Factors					
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	76	84					
2	71					80	
3	49			61			
4	60			61	46		
5	56	56					
6	58			64			
7	80						89
8	80				89		
9	68		77				
10	71	79					
11	41	53					
12	66			47		-61	
13	75		85				

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis allowed us to drop variable 4 as being represented by variable 12, *Opposition to school policy by civic officials*.

The others kept were: variable 1, *Informal advice on school policy by business leaders*; variable 3, *Large taxpayers represented on board*; variable 7, *Large taxpayers as absentee landlords*; variable 8, *Opposition to school policy by large taxpayers*; and, variable 9, *Opposition to school policy by business leaders*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: What does the presence of mass media executives as community leaders have to do with extensive use of formal and informal advice from leading individuals in the community?

Factor 2: Do civic officials follow the lead of the business leaders when they oppose school policies?

Factor 3: Do civic officials lend support on school issues only when large taxpayer interest is visible?

Factor 4: Do schools seek out large taxpayers for informal advice when opposition seems likely from them?

Factor 5: Are civic officials more likely to lend support to the schools if business opinion is not evident -- particularly on the board of education?

F. Bibliography

Citizen Co-operation for Better Public Schools. 53rd Yearbook, I, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Educational Aids For Schools and Colleges. National Association of Manufacturers, Education Department, (1956-57 catalog), New York, 1956.

Handbook of N.A.M. Activities and Services per Education-Industry Cooperation. National Association of Manufacturers, Education Department, New York, April, 1955.

"The Nation's Schools." *Report To Members*. National Association of Manufacturers, New York, 1956.

Sargent, Noel. *Fifty-Four Year Interest In Education*. National Association of Manufacturers, New York, 1949.

XX. COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP: GROUPS

A. Variables

1. Religious groups: informal advice on school policy

   (S-14): To what extent is informal advice on school policy given the district by representatives of each of these groups:

   a. religious organizations?
   b. labor unions?
   c. agricultural organizations?

2. Labor unions: informal advice on school policy

   (S-14b): See 1

3. Agricultural groups: informal advice on school policy

   (S-14c): See 1

4. Religious groups: representation on school board

   (S-75): Are formal representatives of any of these groups presently members of the district board of control:

   a. religious organizations?
   b. labor unions?
   c. agricultural organizations?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Labor unions: representation on school board

   (S-75b): See 4

6. Agricultural groups: representation on school board

   (S-75c): See 4

7. Religious groups: opposition to school policy

   (S-78): To what extent is opposition to school policies to be found among representatives of each of these groups:

   a. religious organizations?
   d. labor unions?
   e. agricultural organizations?

8. Labor unions: opposition to school policy

(S-78d): See 7

9. Agricultural groups: opposition to school policy

(S-78e): See 7

10. Political parties: action on school issues

(M-11): Do local political parties take stand on issues concerning the schools?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

11. Political parties: endorsement of school board candidates (M-12)

(Code: 3--yes, and contribute to campaign expenses
2--yes, but no campaign contribution
1--no, but identify with candidates
0--none of the above)

12. Democrats in district, percent of

(M-13): About what proportion of the voters in the district are Republicans and what proportion are Democrats?

13. Chamber of commerce: no. of cooperative programs with school

(2F-40): What programs or activities are undertaken by the district in cooperation with each of the following groups:

a. chamber of commerce?
b. civic and service clubs?
c. religious groups?
d. agricultural groups?
e. labor unions?

(Code is the no. of activities listed)

14. Civic and service clubs: no. of cooperative programs with school

(2F-40): See 13

15. Religious groups: no. of cooperative programs with school

(2F-40): See 13

16. Agricultural groups: no. of cooperative programs with school

(2F-40): See 13

17. Labor unions: no. of cooperative programs with school

(2F-40): See 13

18. Chamber of Commerce: support on school issues

(BP-31): What actions related to school issues has a local Chamber of Commerce (civic and service clubs, religious groups, labor unions, and agricultural organizations) taken in recent years?

a. support given financial issues
b. support given non-financial issues
c. interest expressed in school matters

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .984
Scalability, items = .944
Scalability, individuals = .894

19. Civic and service clubs: support on school issues

(BP-32): See 18

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .986
Scalability, items = .946
Scalability, individuals = .922

20. Religious groups: support on school issues

(BP-35): See 18

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .999
Scalability, items = .999
Scalability, individuals = .999

21. Labor unions: support on school issues

(BP-33): See 18

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .975
Scalability, items = .862
Scalability, individuals = .692

22. Agricultural organizations: support on school issues (BP-34): See 18

Scale criteria:

Reproducibility = .997
Scalability, items = .957
Scalability, individuals = .944

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with:			
						U	Q	A	P
1	149	2.10	2.00	.83	.78	-04	-16	-03	-18
2	131	1.82	2.00	.86	.93	-14	-24**	-12	-01
3	119	2.02	2.00	1.02	.79	-02	-09	-04	05
4	142	.12	.00	.32	2.34	-06	-18*	-10	-12
5	120	.05	.00	.22	4.13	32	00	09	10
6	116	.16	.00	.36	1.90	13	01	02	08
7	152	1.84	2.00	.73	1.07	-03	-07	-11	04
8	116	1.55	1.00	.66	.79	-11	-18*	-14	13
9	104	1.60	1.00	.77	1.09	-10	-16	-08	26*
10	133	.29	.00	.45	.95	-17*	-06	-11	09
11	120	.58	.00	1.04	1.52	-05	06	06	00
12	126	59.37	60.00	21.48	-.02	13	04	35**	-18
13	114	1.20	1.00	1.37	1.25	17	-18	-13	-09
14	114	1.99	2.00	1.71	1.34	09	-03	17	-06
15	115	.63	.00	.92	2.16	-08	-10	-08	-01
16	114	.53	.00	.91	1.77	06	05	-07	-09
17	114	.27	.00	.55	1.92	01	-16	-14	-06
18	141	.99	1.00	1.03	.49	09	-22**	-06	-07
19	144	.89	1.00	.91	.50	02	-26**	05	-02
20	146	.37	.00	.72	1.61	05	-12	-03	11
21	107	.53	.00	.92	1.41	19*	-20*	-04	15
22	106	.18	.00	.41	2.08	-04	-02	11	-10

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	72					64				
2	76						76			
3	79		80							
4	59			-73						
5	73						44			67
6	69									77
7	73					84				
8	68						75			
9	66		78							
10	79				88					
11	77				82					
12	57								62	
13	58							57		
14	71							79		
15	75							82		
16	75								69	
17	72	43								
18	72	79								
19	63	61								
20	56	40				49				
21	76	69		45						
22	57		41	47						

D. Variables retained

We dropped two variables with significant criterion correlations because of factor analysis results. Variable 18 was dropped on the basis of Factor 1 loadings and variable 8 because of Factor 6 loadings. We kept: variable 2, *Informal advice on school policy from labor unions*; variable 4, *Religious groups represented on board;* variable 9, *Opposition to school policy by agricultural groups*; variable 10, *Action on school issues by political parties*; variable 12, *Percent of Democrats in district*; variable 19, *Support on school issues by civic and service clubs*; and, variable 21, *Support on school issues by labor unions*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Is support from community groups pretty much contingent on each group seeing that the other groups will also be supporting the schools?

Factor 3: Does the indication of agricultural and labor group support in the absence of religious representation on the board of education stem from differences in board representation and support sources by size of district? Or, are they directly related?

Factor 5: What does the presence of both support and opposition from religious groups in the same districts mean? Are they different groups involved? Are these representative of different situations?

Factor 6: Why are labor representation on the board and informal advice from labor found in the same districts where labor opposes school policies?

F. Bibliography

Business-Education Days. Washington D. C.: U. S. Chamber of Commerce, mimeographed (undated).

Citizen Co-operation for Better Public Schools. 53rd Yearbook, I, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Explaining Business In Your Community: An Action Program for Chambers of Commerce. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 1957.

Leadership And Services: Progress Report Of The Chamber of Commerce. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 1957.

XXI. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

A. Variables

1. Community services by school personnel, no. of

   (S-36): What public services have district school personnel contributed to their community -- apart from their regular assignments?

2. School services by community agencies, no. of

   (S-102): What do local community agencies contribute in the way of services to the school district?

3. School conflicts with civic institutions, no. of

   (S-103): In what areas have you experienced difficult relations with a local civic institution, such as a library, for example?

4. Community-school communications: citizen letters

   (S-108): Are citizen letters published in any district publication?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Community-school communications: use of community surveys (S-109)

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

6. Civic institutions: no. of cooperative programs (2F-40c)

7. Joint school-community programs, no. of (2F-40f)

8. Official investigations of schools, no. of

   (BP-37): Has the district ever been formally investigated by an official body?

9. Official investigations of schools: outcome

   (BP-37): See 8

   (Code: 1--unfavorable to schools
   2--favorable to schools)

10. Employer satisfaction with local school product

(BP-38): To what extent do local employers seem to be satisfied with products of the district schools?

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	154	3.20	3.00	1.91	.30	05	-12	-04	-02
2	148	2.33	2.00	1.93	.83	15	-14	-03	02
3	153	.12	.00	.38	3.39	06	-20*	11	-13
4	130	.42	.00	.51	.49	-03	-10	02	06
5	153	.20	.00	.40	1.53	-08	-15	-08	-01
6	114	1.36	1.00	1.60	1.62	03	-08	07	-13
7	115	1.35	1.00	1.77	1.90	-02	-11	04	-05
8	152	.32	.00	.64	2.23	-16*	-05	-19	10
9	28	1.64	2.00	.48	-.60	48*	12	20	38
10	139	4.09	4.00	.86	-1.25	19*	-04	14	-11

C. Factor analysis

		Factors				
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5
1	50		64			
2	68		79			
3	65			72		
4	66			75		
5	81					89
6	75	84				
7	77	87				
8	68				75	
9	87	-48	59			45
10	72				-70	

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis did not yield any reduction in variables. We kept the four with significant criterion relationship: variable 3, *No. of school conflicts with civic institutions*; variable 8, *No. of official investigations of schools*; variable 9, *Favorable outcome of official investigations*; and, variable 10, *Employer satisfaction with local school product*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Why are programs sponsored cooperatively by the schools and community agencies related to negative outcomes of official investigations of schools?

Factor 2: Why are services rendered by school personnel to the community and services rendered the school by community agencies related to positive outcomes of official investigations of schools?

Factor 4: Is dissatisfaction among community employers functionally related to official investigations of schools being instituted?

Factor 5: What is there about community surveys that would explain the positive relationship between their use and favorable outcomes of official investigations?

F. Bibliography

Carter, Richard F. Voters and Their Schools. Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1960.

Carter, Richard F. and Sutthoff, John. Communities And Their Schools. School of Education, Stanford University, 1960.

Citizens Co-operate for Better Public Schools, 53rd Yearbook, I, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: Wiley, 1958.

Kindred, Leslie W. School Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Lewis, Mark. The Relationship of Perceived Past School Experience And Attitude Toward Local Schools Today. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1961.

McCloskey, Gordon. Education And Public Understanding. New York: Harper, 1959.

XXII. BOARD OF EDUCATION

A. Variables

1. Board member characteristics: no. of males* (B & BP)
2. Board member characteristics: average age (B & BP)
3. Board member characteristics: average educational level (B & BP)
4. Board member characteristics: average years lived in community (B & BP)
5. Board member characteristics: average years served on board (B & BP)
6. Board member characteristics: no. with teaching experience (B & BP)
7. Board member characteristics: no. of spouses with teaching experience (B & BP)
8. Board member characteristics: no. with children (B & BP)
9. Board member characteristics: no. with children in public school (B & BP)
10. Board policy: teacher grievance

    (T-5): Does district policy allow teachers to go directly to board members with a grievance?

    (Code: 0--no policy
    1--policy, but no access
    2--policy, with direct access to board)

11. Board member characteristics: no. with children in private school (B & BP)
12. Board member characteristics: average hrs. devoted to board business

    (B-1 & BP-1): How many hours each week, outside of regularly scheduled meetings, do you personally spend on board business?

* Board member characteristics based on the five interviewed -- if more than five on the board.

13. Board contact with public

    (See XIV:2)

14. Board reaction to proposed changes from public

    (See XIV:4)

15. Educational goals: prepare children for problems in adult life

    (B-4 & BP-46): Assuming that the following purposes are goals of most schools, how would you rank them in importance?

    a. prepare children for problems of adult life?
    b. prepare children for citizenship?
    c. develop intellectual abilities of children?
    d. give children sense of our cultural heritage?

    (Score is average ranking by board members)

16. Educational goals: prepare children for citizenship

    (B-4 & BP-46): See 15

17. Educational goals: develop intellectual abilities of children

    (B-4 & BP-46): See 15

18. Educational goals: give children sense of cultural heritage

    (B-4 & BP-46): See 15

19. Board referral of citizen proposals to the superintendent

    (See I:38)

20. Board meetings: media attendance permitted

    (See XVI:8)

21. Board procedures: covert action

    (M-4): To what extent does it seem to you that major decisions in this school district are made informally and rubber-stamped at board meetings?

22. Implementation of board decisions: superintendent reaction to accomplished change

(See I:29)

23. Academic freedom: board member attitude

(B-8 & BP-47): To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

a. Teachers should take loyalty oath before being allowed to teach.
b. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions outside the classroom on any subject.
c. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions inside the classroom on any subject.
e. Any group, representing any viewpoint, should be able to use school facilities for a public meeting.

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .886
Scalability, items = .665
Scalability, individuals - .607

Average score used (all board members)

24. Board selection: years needed to change majority (BP-3)

25. Board selection: filling vacancy

(BP-4): When a board vacancy occurs before the end of a term of office, how is it filled?

(Code: 1--appointed
2--elected)

26. Board recalls

(BP-5): In recent years, have there been any moves to recall a board member in this district? When? What was the outcome?

(Code: 0--none
1--yes, but failed
2--yes, and succeeded)

27. Board meetings: average no. of citizens attending

(See XVI:2)

28. Board meetings: no. of special interest groups attending

(See XVI:3)

29. Board meetings: publication of agenda

(See XVI:4)

30. Board action: provision for reporting to public

(See XIV:5)

31. Board meetings: citizen opinion allowed

(See XIV:6)

32. Board meetings: citizen questions allowed

(See XIV:7)

33. Advisory committee to the board

(BP-15): Does the board maintain any standing advisory committees, composed at least in part of citizens?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

34. Advisory committee tasks: analyze procedures

(BP-15): Which of the following tasks have been assigned to your advisory committee:

a. to analyze procedures used in other districts?
b. to analyze only one proposal for confirmation?
c. to analyze several proposals and make a recommendation?
d. to review needs of the district?
e. to review policies of the district?
f. to study specific problems in the district but make its own proposals?
g. to study any problem it wants to?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

35. Advisory committee tasks: analyze one proposal for confirmation

(BP-15): See 34

36. Advisory committee tasks: analyze proposals and recommend

(BP-15): See 34

37. Advisory committee tasks: review district needs

(BP-15): See 34

38. Advisory committee tasks: review district policy

(BP-15): See 34

39. Advisory committee tasks: study specific problems and recommend

(BP-15): See 34

40. Advisory committee tasks: study problem of own choice

(BP-15): See 34

41. Advisory committees, no. of areas studied by (BP-16)

42. Board member qualifications: average evaluation by teacher (See also 43)

(T-34): We would like to have your evaluation of each board member. To what extent do you feel he is:

a. tactful with the public?
b. responsible?
c. able?

Scale criteria:		BP	B member #4
	Reproducibility	= .977	.983
	Scalability, items	= .926	.948
	Scalability, individuals	= .860	.896

(Analysis of two board members was sufficient to establish scale coefficients)

43. Board member qualifications: average evaluation by parent

(P-14): See 42

Scale criteria:		B member #2
	Reproducibility	= .984
	Scalability, items	= .949
	Scalability, individuals	= .894

(This and the two above were sufficient to establish scale coefficients)

The correlation between T and P assessments (variables 42 and 43) is .12.

44. Board member selection method (1F-p.4)

(Code: 1--appointed
2--elected)

45. Board election procedures: term of office, in years (1F-p.4)

46. Board election procedures: yrs. between elections (1F-p.4)

47. Board election procedures: candidate nomination (1F-p.4)

(Code: 1--by local or county civic officials
2--by caucus
4--by self)

48. Board election procedures: area of representation (1F-p.4)

(Code: 1--district-at-large
2--ward
3--both)

49. Board election procedures: election date requirement (1F-p.4)

(Code: 1--in conjunction with state or national election
0--otherwise)

50. Board educational value similarity

(B-4 & BP-46): The average difference between board members' rankings. See 15

51 School board relations: understanding among members

(I) Average agreement on impact of factors in district.

52. Board disagreement, extent of

(S-64): To what extent would you say there are disagreements among members of the district board of control?

53. Board disagreements, no. of situations

(S-65): What situations usually bring about the most obvious disagreements among board members?

54. Board reaction to proposed changes from the superintendent

(See I:46)

55. Board-superintendent educational value similarity

(See I:54)

56. Board president contact with public

(See XIV:1)

57. Board president reaction to proposed changes from public

(See XIV:3)

58. Board meetings: media coverage without reporting

(See XVI:9)

59. Religion and the schools: board member attitude

(B-8 & BP-47): To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

g. schools should provide released time for pupils to have religious instruction
h. public funds should be used to provide transportation for parochial school pupils
i. religious groups should be able to use school facilities for private social purposes
j. federal aid should be given parochial schools to help support the secular parts of their program

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .890
Scalability, items = .691
Scalability, individuals = .615

Average score used (all board members)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	154	4.23	4.00	.84	-.79	08	12	07	00
2	154	48.99	48.90	5.86	.30	19*	-15	03	03
3	154	14.38	15.00	2.48	-1.89	00	-20*	-25*	15
4	154	31.39	31.30	11.66	.15	10	-06	02	12
5	154	7.08	6.40	4.46	3.56	13	01	11	-14
6	154	1.02	1.00	1.04	.82	-05	-18*	09	07
7	154	.93	1.00	.99	1.02	02	-04	02	05
8	153	4.50	5.00	.99	-2.51	13	-03	02	-23*
9	150	4.03	5.00	1.30	-1.24	10	-03	-14	-12
10	152	.97	1.00	.87	.05	13	05	29**	-02
11	151	.70	.00	1.08	1.44	-13	-05	-06	06
12	153	6.20	4.40	5.34	2.39	-32***	-22**	-21*	07
15	144	2.19	2.20	.56	.26	-07	08	16	16
16	144	2.31	2.30	.44	.09	-22**	-12	-32**	-15
17	144	1.89	1.80	.52	.33	09	-07	02	06
18	144	3.55	3.60	.35	-.83	19*	14	-05	-10
21	131	2.55	2.00	1.23	.51	-11	23**	-04	11
23	154	2.23	2.20	.63	-.03	-07	10	-10	17
24	137	3.66	4.00	1.73	1.01	04	02	23*	04
25	148	1.07	1.00	.25	3.45	-10	02	08	-12
26	153	.10	.00	.38	4.03	-10	-07	04	-03
33	153	.27	.00	.44	1.05	-03	-10	-09	-14
34	41	.27	.00	.44	1.05	08	-05	-03	10
35	41	.44	.00	.50	.25	24	-05	09	-01

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
36	41	.49	.00	.50	.05	25	10	08	32
37	41	.61	1.00	.49	-.45	00	-14	-02	22
38	41	.17	.00	.38	1.75	22	-28	-08	27
39	41	.68	1.00	.46	-.79	-21	02	-18	32
40	41	.24	.00	.43	1.19	-11	-02	-30	21
41	42	2.00	2.00	1.41	.86	-03	-15	13	-09
42	147	1.89	2.00	.76	-.21	18*	-01	02	-02
43	144	1.93	2.00	.74	-.28	33***	02	16	00
44	133	1.86	2.00	.35	-2.04	03	-19*	-13	10
45	130	4.26	4.00	1.25	.16	-03	-13	12	11
46	107	1.65	2.00	.53	.30	-04	-24*	03	19
47	105	3.50	4.00	.90	-1.33	13	-12	01	-10
48	109	1.30	1.00	.71	3.48	10	06	30**	04
49	101	.84	1.00	.36	-1.87	-05	-26*	18	-11
50	142	16.41	16.50	6.20	.05	13	02	-04	-03
51	136	1.54	1.39	.82	.56	82***	07	39***	-12
52	145	2.03	2.00	.85	1.08	-26**	-05	-18	16
53	129	1.39	1.00	.99	.57	-20*	-16	-29**	06
59	154	1.73	1.60	.70	.62	-18*	14	-09	03

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1	70	-53																				
2	81		78																			
3	72	53																				
4	70			77																		
5	82			78																		
6	78																					
7	84																					87
8	78				83																	
9	85				85																	
10	77													67								
11	71																			46		
12	75	60																				
13	82	85																				
14	75											74										
15	82						55															
16	73																	70				
17	90																	-89				
18	86						-87															
19	68															74						
20	71																		-44			
21	78								86													
22	71															56						
23	62												-56									
24	69										70											
25	82														88							

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
											Factors											
26	50																-41					
27	91																			84		
28	77	54																				
29	63																	40				
30	67									72												
31	74																75					
32	80																74					
34	81		66																			
35	96	-42						-46		-50												
36	88		79																			
37	94		59																			
38	99		40								-53			41								
39	82		57																			
40	97																					
41	97																			71		
42	73								-40													
43	66							74														
44	78					-41																
45	79										80											
47	81															47						
48	69																					
49	72											-51									44	
50	84						83															

Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
51	76					45																
52	68																		72			
53	71																		58			
54	72																				79	
55	80												74									
56	76	80																				
57	77											86										
58	68				40									-47								
59	71					76																

Variables 33 and 46 were omitted because of artifactual correlations with 34-40 and 44, respectively.

D. Variables retained

The factor analysis yielded only one reduction in the variables to be retained. Factor 18 has two variables with similar criterion correlations, and we kept only variable 53, *No. of situations where board disagrees*. That so many factors were derived from the correlation matrix (21 factors) is evidence of the heterogeneity of variables within the division.

We kept these variables: variable 2, *Average age of board members*; variable 3, *Average educational level of board members*; variable 6, *No. of board members with teaching experience*; variable 8, *No. of board members with children*; variable 10, *Board policy on teacher grievance*; variable 12, *Average time devoted to board business by board members*; variable 16, *Board educational goal: prepare children for citizenship*; variable 18, *Board educational goal: give children sense of cultural heritage*; variable 21, *Covert action by board on major decisions*; variable 24, *Years needed to change board majority*; variable 42, *Teacher evaluation of board members*; variable 43, *Parent evaluation of board members*; variable 44, *Board member selection method*; variable 46, *Years between board elections*; variable 48, *Area represented by board members: ward*; variable 49, *Date requirement for board election*; variable 51, *Understanding among board members*; and, variable 59, *Board attitude on religion and public schools*.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Would size of district account for the higher educational level of boards that spend more time on board business and have more contact with the public? Is the use of board advisory groups simply to analyze one proposal for confirmation less likely in districts whose board members are more highly educated and/or whose board meetings are attended by special interest groups?

Factor 2: Should the scope of activity for board advisory committees be more restricted, given the five different functions tend to be undertaken in some districts -- and none are significantly related to any criterion variable?

Factor 5: Why is the degree of understanding among board members less in districts where board members are elected? Why is there a less liberal attitude toward religion in the schools where board members are elected?

Factor 6: Do boards that consider preparing children for adult life the prime goal of schools tend to downgrade giving children a sense of their cultural heritage -- and vice versa?

Factor 7: Do parents make less favorable assessments of board members whose advisory committees are assigned the function of analyzing only one proposal for confirmation?

Factor 8: Are less favorable assessments of board members by teachers more likely when the board takes covert action on major issues of policy?

Factor 10: Why are boards with longer terms of office for their members less likely to assign their advisory committees the function of reviewing district policy?

Factor 12: Why do boards with more liberal views on academic freedom appear in those districts where there is agreement on educational values between superintendent and board?

Factor 13: Is it more feasible for boards to offer teachers a chance to air their grievances directly to the board if there is no media coverage of board meetings? Does this also hold for the boards' assigning their advisory committees to reviewing district policy?

Factor 16: Is the incidence of board recall elections less in those districts where citizens can ask questions and express their opinions at board meetings?

Factor 17: Do boards that emphasize preparing children for citizenship make more effort to publish a board agenda? Why are both negatively related to the educational goal of developing the child's intellectual abilities?

Factor 18: Can we infer from the evidence that boards are less likely to allow media attendance where there are more board disagreements that the latter is responsible for the former?

F. Bibliography

American Association of School Administrators. School Board in Action. 24th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1946.

American Association of School Administrators. School Board-Superintendent Relationships. 34th Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1956.

Barnhart, Richard E. "The Critical Requirements For School Board Membership Based Upon An Analysis Of Critical Incidents", Studies In Education. Thesis Abstract, Indiana University, 1952.

Boardsmanship, (ed. H. Thomas James). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "Research On School Board Personnel: Critique and Prospectus", Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 47, No. 5 (January, 1954.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: Wiley, 1958.

Houle, Cyril O. The Effective Board. New York: Association Press, 1960.

Reeder, Ward G. School Boards And Superintendents. New York: Macmillan, 1954.

Sletten, Vernon O. "Policy Questions -- Do Board Members And Superintendents Agree?", Administrator's Notebook. Vol. 7, No. 4 (December, 1958).

Stapley, Maurice E. School Board Studies. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

XXIII. CITIZENS' COMMITTEES

A. Variables

1. Citizens' committee on school affairs (BP-17)

   (Code: 0--never had one
   1--had one, but not at present
   2--have temporary one at present
   3--have permanent one at present

2. Citizens' committee on school affairs: origin (BP-17)

   (Code: 1--initiated by schools
   2--initiated by citizens' group
   3--both)

3. Citizens' committee on school affairs: purpose (BP-17)

   (Code: 2--for curriculum, relations with public, consolidation or unification
   1--for bonds, buildings, general improvement, needs and problems
   0--other)

4. Citizens' committee tasks: analyze procedures

   (BP-18): Which of the following tasks have been assigned to any standing advisory committees:

   a. analyze procedures used in other districts?
   b. analyze only one proposal for confirmation?
   c. analyze several proposals and make a recommendation?
   d. review needs of the district?
   e. review policies of the district?
   f. study specific problems in the district but make own proposals?
   g. study any problem the committee wants to?

   (Code: 0--no
   1--yes)

5. Citizens' committee tasks: analyze one proposal for information

   (BP-18): See 4

6. Citizens' committee tasks: analyze proposals and recommend

   (BP-18): See 4

7. Citizens' committee tasks: review district needs

   (BP-18): See 4

8. Citizens' committee tasks: review district policy

   (BP-18): See 4

9. Citizens' committee tasks: study specific problems and recommend

   (BP-18): See 4

10. Citizens' committee tasks: study problem of own choice

    (BP-18): See 4

11. Participation in election campaign (BP-19)

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes, as part of the school campaign organization
    2--yes, on its own)

12. Campaign participation: endorsement of issues

    (BP-19): Which of these means of participation were used by a citizens' committee in an election campaign:

    a. endorsement of issues?
    b. mailouts?
    c. telephone canvassing?
    d. door-to-door canvassing?
    e. neighborhood coffee meetings?
    f. sponsorship of public meetings?
    g. transportation service to the polls?
    h. voter registration drive?
    i. babysitting service on election day?

    (Code: 0--no
    1--yes)

13. Campaign participation: mailouts

    (BP-19): See 12

14. Campaign participation: telephoning

    (BP-19): See 12

15. Campaign participation: door-to-door canvassing

(BP-19): See 12

16. Campaign participation: coffee meetings

(BP-19): See 12

17. Campaign participation: public meetings

(BP-19): See 12

18. Campaign participation: transportation service

(BP-19): See 12

19. Campaign participation: voter registration

(BP-19): See 12

20. Campaign participation: babysitting service

(BP-19): See 12

21. Campaign participation, extent of

See variables 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .960
Scalability, items = .894
Scalability, individuals = .720

22. Publications by citizens' committee

(BP-20): Apart from any election campaign activities, did the district citizens' committee publish any bulletins or reports?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

23. Public meetings sponsored by citizens' committee

(BP-21): Apart from any election campaign activities did the citizens' committee sponsor public meetings for any of these purposes:

a. to discuss teaching methods?
b. to discuss curriculum?
c. to discuss potentially controversial issues?
d. to discuss controversial issues in the district?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .965
Scalability, items = .829
Scalability, individuals = .675

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with:			
						U	Q	A	P
1	144	1.14	1.00	1.15	.53	-23**	-28***	-20	08
2	85	1.48	1.00	.59	.77	-12	19	-07	07
3	87	1.32	1.00	.67	-.48	-09	-24*	10	01
4	89	.33	.00	.47	.74	-14	-08	08	08
5	89	.26	.00	.44	1.10	13	14	08	05
6	89	.34	.00	.47	.69	-05	-13	01	-01
7	89	.60	1.00	.49	-.39	04	-03	-02	04
8	89	.33	.00	.47	.74	-19	-11	00	-06
9	89	.58	1.00	.49	-.34	-18	-12	-21	-07
10	89	.33	.00	.47	.74	-15	-11	-04	04
11	88	.93	1.00	.88	.13	09	-16	-09	02
12	50	.90	1.00	.30	-2.67	-03	02	-14	-03
13	51	.72	1.00	.45	-1.01	10	-05	05	12
14	50	.86	1.00	.35	-2.08	16	-01	-19	-13
15	51	.78	1.00	.41	-1.38	-02	08	-10	08
16	50	.60	1.00	.49	-.41	09	11	11	-10
17	50	.74	1.00	.44	-1.09	10	-15	25	-05
18	51	.53	1.00	.50	-.12	10	26	-05	-34*
19	50	.48	.00	.50	.08	30*	-02	07	02
20	50	.44	.00	.50	.24	13	-10	22	-05
21	51	4.12	5.00	1.74	-.82	20	10	-04	-14
22	87	.40	.00	.49	.40	-17	04	-07	-08
23	89	1.03	.00	1.28	.96	-01	-06	-02	05

C. Factor analysis

		Factors				
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5
1	66		71			
2	62			67		
3	72					82
4	39	56				
5	66	-61				
6	52	71				
7	58	61				
8	68	53			40	43
9	62	77				
10	60		70			
11	72				83	
21	54			67		
22	69		51	-51		
23	68		74			

Variables 12-20 were omitted as components of homogeneous scale (variable 21).

D. Variables retained

We were unable to eliminate any of the four variables significantly related to a criterion on the basis of the factor analysis. We kept: variable 1, Citizens' committee on school affairs; variable 3, Purpose of citizens' committee; variable 18, Transportation service to polls by citizens' committee; and, variable 19, Voter registration by citizens' committee.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Should the scope of citizens' committee functions be restricted, since the same districts have their committees doing five of them -- and none are significantly related to a criterion (see: Division XXII; Section E, Factor 2)?

Factor 2: Does the evidence that districts having citizens' committees at the present are giving a choice of function to them, and that the committees are holding public meetings and publishing reports, represent a reaction to the previous lack of success of citizens' committees?*

Factor 3: Is the extent of campaign participation by citizens' committees greater when the committees are originated by the schools?

Factor 4: Why is campaign participation by citizens' committees more likely when they are given the function of reviewing district policy?

Factor 5: Does the reviewing of district policy necessarily lead to consideration of curriculum and relations with the public?

F. Bibliography

Citizen Co-operation for Better Public Schools. 53rd Yearbook, I, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Hamlin, Herbert M. Citizens' Committees In The Public Schools. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printing Co., 1952.

Hull, J. H. "Functioning Patterns Of Lay Advisory Committee Organization", American School Board Journal. Vol. 119 (December, 1949).

Kenny, Donald. A Functional Analysis Of Citizens' Committees During School Financial Elections. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1961.

Larsen, Roy E. "The Organization And Work Of The National Citizens' Commission For Public Schools", School Executive. Vol. 71 (June, 1952).

---

* Kenny (see Section F) found that citizens' committees were not effective in passing financial issues. Their efforts sometimes resulted in greater participation -- but in lower acquiescence.

XXIV. MASS MEDIA

A. Variables

1. Coverage of school matters: content

   (S-93): To what extent, generally speaking, does the district get each of these kinds of coverage by local mass media:

   a. personnel profiles?
   b. reports of official meetings?
   c. reports of new curriculum developments?
   d. progress reports on a regular basis?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .923
Scalability, items = .776
Scalability, individuals = .697

2. Mass media effort in school-community relations

   (S-94): To what extent, generally speaking, do the local mass media undertake each of these roles with respect to the district schools:

   a. explaining school problems to the public?
   b. seeking both sides of controversies involving schools?
   c. telling the schools about public views on educational problems?
   d. stimulating public interest in schools?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .970
Scalability, items = .905
Scalability, individuals = .875

3. Competition among mass media: district policy

   (S-95): What policy does the district have with respect to the needs of competing mass media?

   (Code: 0--none, favoritism, or other
   1--unspecified means of equalizing competition
   2--specific means of equalizing competition

4. Competition: no. of mass media covering school news (S-96)

5. Newspapers covering school news, no. of (S-96)

6. TV stations covering school news, no. of (S-96)

7. Radio stations covering school news, no. of (S-96)

8. Mass media support of schools in last election

   (S-97): Ratio of the number of mass media supporting the schools in the last election campaign to the total number of mass media covering district news.

9. Mass media support of schools during controversy

   (S-98): Ratio of the number of mass media supporting the schools during a controversy to the total number of mass media covering district news.

10. Responsibility shown in mass media: no. of problems in checking stories

    (S-99): Has there been any problem with any of the media because of a failure on their part to check stories with school officials?

11. School news coverage, no. of reporters regularly assigned to (S-100)

12. Mass media executives, no. of as community leaders

    (See XIX:11)

13. Responsibility shown in mass media: extent of checking stories

    (BP-10): To what extent do representatives of the local mass media follow a policy of checking stories about the schools with district officials?

14. Lack of responsibility shown in mass media: degree of

    (BP-11): In general, to what extent do the mass media in this school district exhibit these characteristics:

    a. lack of responsibility?
    b. inaccurate reporting?
    c. unfavorable biases toward schools?
    d. a tendency to sensationalize school news?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .932
Scalability, items = .803
Scalability, individuals = .697

15. Mass media-school relations: no. of critical incidents

(BP-12): Have any incidents affected the school's working relationship with the mass media? What?

16. Mass media-school relations: school policy

(M-1, 2, 3, 10):

1. Are representatives of the mass media allowed to attend all meetings of the board of education in this school district?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

2. Are there any meetings of the district board of education which the mass media can cover but are not allowed to report?

(Code: 0--no
1--yes)

3. Apart from board meetings, does the local school district make it difficult in any way for you to gather news about school matters? (Response is the no. of difficulties)

10. Have there been any recent incidents which affected your working relationship with the local schools? (Response is no. of incidents)

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .933
Scalability, items = .673
Scalability, individuals = .735

17. Mass media purposes: presenting community's view

(M-5): Assuming that the following four purposes are some of the objectives of most media, how would you rank them in importance? Which would you say is most important?

a. presenting the community's views to the schools?
b. presenting both sides of controversial school issues?
c. presenting discussions of general educational problems?
d. presenting the local schools to the community?

18. Mass media purposes: presenting both sides of issues

(M-5): See 17

19. Mass media purposes: presenting discussions of problems

(M-5): See 17

20. Mass media purposes: presenting school's view

(M-5): See 17

21. No. of ways mass media calm school controversy (M-6)

22. No. of joint school-mass media projects (M-7)

23. Coverage of school matters: no. of awards given medium or a member of its staff (M-8)

24. Mass media in "watchdog" role

(M-9): To what extent do you feel it is your obligation to the public for you to keep a watchful eye on each of these:

a. the morals of school personnel?
b. school expenditures?
c. efficiency of operation in the schools?
d. quality of instruction?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility = .930
Scalability, items = .789
Scalability, individuals = .682

25. Extent of mass media use: organized opposition

(See XVII:27)

26. Extent of mass media use: individual opposition

(See XVII:28)

27. Mass media, school use of

(See XII:32)

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with: U	Q	A	P
1	152	2.10	2.00	1.21	-.01	06	-10	-06	03
2	153	2.26	2.00	1.26	-.19	13	-10	12	02
3	141	.65	.00	.84	.73	-05	-19*	00	-08
4	150	4.27	4.00	2.15	.40	-08	-33***	-07	11
5	151	2.48	2.00	1.50	1.46	-13	-07	-13	04
6	149	.81	.00	1.22	1.35	03	-24**	09	02
7	149	1.44	1.00	1.66	1.98	00	-25**	-04	12
8	119	.74	1.00	.37	-1.10	18*	-21*	-03	-20
9	108	.52	.50	.42	.00	00	-21*	09	-14
10	148	.67	.00	1.29	2.85	-10	-20*	-11	15
11	150	1.41	1.00	1.18	.50	-10	-12	-21*	13
13	146	3.47	4.00	1.35	-.43	08	-27**	-04	01
14	152	1.86	2.00	1.30	.11	-31***	02	-17	05
15	148	.27	.00	.52	2.05	-13	-03	-07	-02
16	131	1.21	1.00	.85	.84	-13	-09	04	-09
17	119	3.31	4.00	.93	-1.28	-08	-06	-02	-01
18	119	2.02	2.00	1.05	.61	09	23*	11	04
19	119	2.56	3.00	.96	.02	-01	-14	-09	-10
20	119	1.99	2.00	1.00	.52	-03	00	-03	00
21	129	.67	1.00	.67	.52	-02	-11	01	16
22	133	1.44	1.00	1.76	1.55	-02	-23**	-03	-10
23	134	.62	.00	1.18	2.64	04	-17*	05	-02
24	132	2.45	3.00	1.26	-.50	-17*	-09	-17	13

C. Factor analysis

		Factors										
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	71							77				
2	71							77				
3	32	41										
4	88	88										
5	70	47							59			
6	70	79										
7	68	78										
8	80											63
9	83											85
10	70					80						
11	70								74			
12	65								-41			
13	73			73								
14	70			-68								
15	72									61		
16	68									76		
17	79		75									
18	90				85							
19	81						83					
20	84				-80							
21	90										91	
22	46	52										
23	69						-40					
24	71					50						
25	114*		90								44	
26	84		63			49						
27	57											

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 has five variables significantly correlated with quiescence. We kept only variable 4, _No. of mass media covering school news_.

We also kept: variable 8, _Mass media support of schools in last election_; variable 9, _Mass media support of schools during controversy_; variable 10, _No. of problems in checking stories (S); variable 11, No. of reporters regularly assigned to cover school news; variable 13, Extent of checking stories by mass media (BP); variable 14, Lack of responsibility by mass media (BP); variable 18, Presenting both sides of issues as purpose of mass media; variable 23, Awards given local media for school coverage; and variable 24, Mass media in "watchdog" role.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 1: Are joint projects with the media by schools the district's reaction to problems raised by the number of competing media?

Factor 2: Does the opposition to the schools take advantage of those media who see it as their role to present the community's viewpoint? Or is there rationalization by the latter to account for the use of the mass media by the opposition?

Factor 5: Does the media's undertaking of the "watchdog" role raise problems in the checking of story accuracy with the schools because the media take "too independent" a view? Does the opposition also take advantage of the media's donning of the "watchdog" role?

Factor 6: Why is the purpose of presenting discussions of school problems endorsed more often by media that have not won awards for their school coverage?

Factor 8: Why are schools that receive good coverage from the media found in districts where mass media executives are not community leaders?

Factor 10: Do the mass media undertake to calm controversy to the extent that there is organized opposition use of the media?

F. Bibliography

Carter, Richard F. Voters And Their Schools. Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1960.

Kindred, Leslie W., *et al*. *How to Tell the School Story*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Kindred, Leslie W. *School Public Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Mass Media and Education. 53rd Yearbook, II, National Association for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

McCloskey, Gordon. *Education And Public Understanding*. New York: Harper, 1959.

XXV. FISCAL

A. Variables

1. State aid: percent flat grant, general purpose (1F-15)

2. State aid: percent flat grant, special purpose (1F-15)

3. State aid: percent equalizing grant, general purpose (1F-15)

4. State aid: percent equalizing grant, special purpose (1F-15)

5. State fiscal requirements: limit on bonding

   (1F-p.2): Legal limitation on bonding capacity -- percent of assessed valuation

6. State fiscal requirements: bonding level

   (1F-p.2): Present level of bonding -- percent of assessed valuation

7. State fiscal requirements: bond authorization

   (1F-p.2): Percent voter authorization needed to bond

8. Federal aid: percent of district operating income (1F-11)

9. State aid: percent of district operating income (1F-14)

10. Tax levy: minimum required

    (1F-p.3): Minimum no. of mills required

11. Tax levy: minimum suggested

    (1F-p.3): Minimum no. of mills suggested

12. Tax levy: maximum without voter approval

    (1F-p.3): Maximum no. of mills allowed without voter approval

13. Tax levy: maximum with voter approval

    (1F-p.3): Maximum no. of mills allowed with approval

14. Present tax levy (present tax levy in mills) (1F-p.3)

15. Raising tax levy: percent voter authorization needed (1F-p.3)

16. Fiscal requirements: shared tax limit

(S-60): Does the district have to work within a tax limit for a group of local agencies of which the school district is only one?

(Code: 0--no
otherwise--no. of other agencies)

17. Fiscal requirements: shared bonding limit

(S-61): Does the district have to work within a bonding limit for a group of local agencies of which the school district is only one?

(Code: 0--no
otherwise--no. of other agencies)

5

B. Data

						Correlation with:			
Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	U	Q	A	P
1	111	35.32	17.00	37.81	.49	10	-09	02	-01
2	112	9.63	1.00	21.47	3.11	07	07	10	-07
3	114	48.16	47.50	40.21	-.01	-08	-01	-07	02
4	112	7.43	.00	21.61	3.38	-09	08	-05	08
5	102	9.76	8.00	7.23	3.60	04	-14	02	-04
6	111	6.56	5.00	10.40	6.75	-08	-06	04	-07
7	97	54.71	51.00	9.75	-2.14	-12	-06	-09	-10
8	119	2.67	1.00	4.64	3.06	04	09	20	-07
9	118	44.70	43.00	21.84	.21	-08	-15	29*	-24*
10	50	18.68	12.00	30.02	5.54	-04	-05	-24	03
11	24	20.67	15.00	16.46	2.31	26	31	-02	-31
12	64	15.48	14.00	13.66	3.25	05	-11	06	-10
13	52	22.96	16.00	25.12	5.09	01	-21	05	04
14	114	27.76	20.00	29.02	5.05	-03	06	-21	-03
15	67	52.03	51.00	3.17	2.97	01	01	17	-04
16	149	.51	.00	1.21	2.76	00	-13	-14	-01
17	146	.24	.00	.90	4.96	-09	-03	-06	02

C. Factor analysis

		Factors						
Variable	h^2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	94			-90				
2	87					89		
3	98			92				
4	73				-47		-67	
5	89		93					
6	90		95					
7	50						42	48
8	59						74	
9	72				50	53		
10	94	90						
11	118*	84	55					
12	100*	94						
13	94	87						
14	91	80	49					
15	84							84
16	63				76			

Variable 17 was omitted for lack of variance.

* Unstable because of low N.

D. Variables retained

Only one variable in this division has a significant correlation with a criterion. We kept variable 9, Percent of district operating income from state aid.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

Factor 4: What implications should be drawn from the evidence that districts that get more aid from the state and/or who must work within a taxing limit shared with other local agencies also have less state aid in the form of special purpose equalizing grants?

Factor 6: On what basis do districts that get less state aid by special purpose equalizing grants tend to get more federal aid and/or need a higher percentage of "yes" votes to pass their bond issues?

F. Bibliography

Education Code. State of California, Vols. 1 and 2, 1961.

Grieder, Calvin and Rosenstengel, W. E. Public School Administration. New York: Ronald Press, 1954.

Hutchins, Clayton D., *et al*. Trends in Significant Facts on School Finance: 1929-30, 1953-54. U. S. Office of Education, Circular No. 498, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.

Hutchins, Clayton D. and Munse, Albert F. Public School Finance Program of the U. S. U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 22, Washington, D. C.: Government Publishing Office, 1954.

Mort, Paul R., Reusser, Walter C., and Polley, John W. Public School Finance. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Newell, Dwight H. The Relationship Between Certain State Legal Requirements And School-Community Interaction. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1961.

XXVI. INFORMATION

A. Variables

1. Other educational officials: advice and assistance sought by superintendent

    (See I:13)

2. Other educational officials: coordination with

    (See I:14)

3. Outside advice: no. of regular sources

    (S-74): From what non-educational sources does the district receive consultation:

    a. on a regular basis?
    b. on a special basis?

4. Outside advice: no. of special sources

    (S-74): See 3

5. National criticism of education: total effect locally

    (S-80a-f): In your estimation to what extent are national criticisms reflected in local criticisms about each of these areas:

    a. what is being taught?
    b. how things are being taught?
    c. student performance?
    d. administration of the schools?
    e. teacher capability?
    f. the level of taxes?

Scale criteria: Reproducibility =.922
Scalability, items =.793
Scalability, individuals =.647

6. National criticisms heard locally: no. of sources outside the district

    (S-81): Excluding mass media, who are the outside sources from whom national criticism appear to be getting into your district?

7. National criticisms heard locally: no. of sources inside the district

   (S-82): Within the district, who spreads these criticisms?

B. Data

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Correlation with:			
						U	Q	A	P
3	150	.89	.00	1.24	1.20	-01	01	12	-16
4	151	1.21	1.00	1.41	1.68	-08	-21**	03	-06
5	153	2.82	3.00	1.96	.15	-01	-18*	-15	11
6	133	.74	.00	1.02	1.86	-09	-23**	-09	10
7	120	1.03	1.00	.95	1.64	-16	-17	-16	24*

C. Factor analysis

Variable	h^2	Factors 1	2	3
1	74		86	
2	74		85	
3	48			68
4	57			75
5	38	52		
6	69	82		
7	79	87		

D. Variables retained

Factor 1 has three variables with significant criterion correlations, two of which have similar patterns of relationship. We kept variable 6, No. of sources outside district for national criticisms heard locally, and dropped variable 5. We also kept variable 7, No. of sources inside district for national criticisms heard locally.

The other variable in this division with a significant criterion correlation is variable 4, No. of special sources for outside advice.

E. Questions suggested by factor analysis results

No questions were suggested by the factor analysis results.

F. Bibliography

Carter, Richard F. Voters And Their Schools. Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1960.

A Summary of Retained Variables

To conclude this part of our study, we shall list the variables that have been retained for further work in Part II. Each is significantly related to at least one criterion variable. The listing is made according to the criterion variable -- or variables -- to which the retained variable is related. In this way, the reader has an opportunity to note relations among those variables that are potential factors for the alteration of a given condition in school-community relations. A more economic account can be anticipated from the analyses to be reported in Part II.

The numerical reference for each listing is to the original division and variable number. The titles of the variables have been sometimes altered from the original, for clarification outside the original context. A capital letter in parentheses at the end of a title identifies the source for an assessment (e.g., S for superintendent). An asterisk at the end of a title indicates that the variable was selected as representative of one or more other variables that were dropped as redundant. Reference to Sections C and D of the appropriate division will give the information needed to locate the omitted variables.

Variables significantly correlated with understanding only (Positive)

I:4	No. of years experience as a superintendent
I:28	Administrator-parent relations (S)
I:30	Superintendent reaction to criticism
I:32	Administrator-parent relations (P)*
I:52	Superintendent as a school leader (BP)*
I:53	Superintendent as a school leader (T)*
III:3	Purpose of retarded student program: training in personal care
V:4	Parent-teacher conferences: preparation given teachers
V:12	Teacher satisfaction
V:41	Percent of teachers living in district
V:42	No. of community leadership positions held by teachers
XII:31	No. of informational publications for general public
XIII:13	Parent group participation with schools in financial election campaign
XIV:6	Citizen opinions allowed at board meetings
XV:12	Relationship between communities within district
XV:27	1960 per capita retail sales
XV:28	Ratio of district per capita retail sales to state per capita retail sales, 1960
XV:98	1960 percent managers and officials
XV:141	Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state percent in 5-14 age group to 1950 ratio
XVI:5	Citizen knowledge of school needs (BP)
XVI:7	Citizen knowledge of school needs (P)
XVII:1	Lack of criticism on meeting community needs

Understanding, positive (Cont'd)

XVIII:6	Citizen pride in schools*
XXI:9	Favorable outcome of official investigations
XXI:10	Employer satisfaction with local school product
XXII:2	Average age of board members
XXII:18	Board educational goal: give children sense of cultural heritage
XXII:42	Teacher evaluation of board members
XXII:43	Parent evaluation of board members
XXIII:19	Voter registration by citizens' committee

Variables significantly correlated with understanding only (Negative)

I:20	Superintendent attitude toward religion and public schools
II:12	Student misconduct in the classroom (T)
II:30	Student misconduct in the classroom (P)*
III:12	Adult education program: percent devoted to citizenship training
V:23	Percent of teachers in local union
X:4	Teacher participation in budget preparation
XV:36	Ratio of district heterogeneity of income to state heterogeneity of income, 1960
XV:134	Ratio of district mean-median age discrepancy to state discrepancy, 1960
XV:176	1960 percent born in Southern Europe
XV:208	Ratio of 1950 percent of total population with high school education to 1940 percent
XV:246	Ratio of 1950 reciprocal of fertility ratio to 1940 reciprocal of fertility ratio*
XVII:6	Individual criticism of school administration (O)

Understanding, negative (Cont'd)

XVII:17	Individual opposition use of letters to newspapers*
XVIII:8	Optimistic citizen attitude toward business outlook
XIX:7	Large taxpayers as absentee landlords
XIX:8	Opposition to school policy by large taxpayers
XX:10	Action on school issues by political parties
XXI:8	No. of official investigations of schools
XXII:59	Board attitude on religion and public schools
XXIV:14	Lack of responsibility by mass media (BP)
XXIV:24	Mass media in "watchdog" role

Variables significantly correlated with quiescence only (Positive)

II:21	Elementary student rank on national spelling test
II:25	Secondary student rank on national science test
IV:3	Scope of transportation services
IV:9	Counselor-pupil ratio
VIII:33	Teacher dismissal: tenure policy
XIV:10	Permissiveness on community use of school facilities
XV:48	Ratio of district percent employed in agriculture, forestry, and fishing to state percent, 1960
XV:95	1960 reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, within U. S.*
XV:103	1960 percent farmers and farm managers
XV:201	Ratio of 1960 percent of total population with college education to 1950 percent*
XXII:21	Covert action by board on major decisions
XXIV:18	Presenting both sides of issues as purpose of mass media

Variables significantly correlated with quiescence only (negative)

I:12	No. of offices held by superintendent in local, nonprofessional organizations*
I:14	Coordination with other educational officials
II:4	Participation in student programs
II:9	Student participation in discipline
II:17	No. of athletic events scheduled weekday nights
II:27	Percent of eighth graders entering ninth grade
II:37	Pupil-teacher ratio, 9-12
III:6	Purpose of gifted student program: acceleration
III:18	Purpose of summer school program: enrichment
III:22	Audio-visual facilities
III:27	No. of current NDEA experimental programs
III:29	No. of other innovations*
IV:1	Scope of guidance program*
IV:4	Health services: Organization
IV:10	Transportation: no. of accidents
V:9	Staff running for political office*
V:20	Negotiation by professional organization (dismissal or tenure)
V:21	Negotiation by professional organization (profession, policies, training)
V:26	Individual teacher participation in district elections*
V:43	No. of group contributions by teachers to community
V:47	Group teacher participation in election campaigns
V:51	Percent of grades K-6 teachers with any degree
VI:2	In-service training for maintenance staff

Quiescence, negative (Cont'd)

VI:8	Non-teacher staff organization
VI:16	Percent of central office staff with a college degree
VIII:12	Teacher salary levels: no. of criteria used
VIII:18	Teacher dismissal: build case for not renewing contract (T)
VIII:31	Teacher hiring: written exam
VIII:35	Percent of teachers promoted from within district
VIII:36	Classroom use of community resource persons
IX:8	Basis for pupil evaluation: norm for grade level
X:1	No. of long range planning studies
X:18	Business procedures: no. of estimates on nonbid items
X:20	Open hearing on budget*
XI:19	No. of endorsements important to campaign
XI:21	Campaign organization
XI:25	No. of tax levy restrictions
XII:1	School use of public meetings
XII:27	No. of informational publications*
XII:32	School use of mass media
XIII:4	Bulletins published by parent groups*
XIII:12	Parent group participation in financial election campaign
XIV:5	Provision for reporting board action to public
XV:42	Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state imbalance toward high income to 1950 ratio
XV:65	Percent employed in services, 1960*
XV:186	Ratio of 1950-60 district to state percent population increase ratio to 1940-50 district to state ratio

Quiescence, negative (Cont'd)

XV:233	Ratio of district median educational level to state median level, 1960
XV:256	1960 percent population in urban place
XV:262	1960 rank on isolation index (less isolated)*
XV:268	1960 percent using auto transportation
XVII:15	Individual opposition use of radio/TV discussions
XVII:24	Organized opposition use of radio/TV discussions
XIX:1	Informal advice on school policy by business leaders
XIX:12	Opposition to school policy by civic officials*
XX:2	Informal advice on school policy from labor unions*
XX:4	Religious groups represented on board
XX:19	Support on school issues by civic and service clubs*
XXI:3	No. of school conflicts with civic institutions
XXII:6	No. of board members with teaching experience
XXII:44	Board member selection method: elected
XXII:46	Years between board elections
XXII:49	Date requirement for board election
XXIII:3	Purpose of citizens' committee: policy issues
XXIV:4	No. of mass media covering school news*
XXIV:9	Mass media support of schools during controversy
XXIV:10	No. of problems in checking stories (S)
XXIV:13	Extent of checking stories by mass media (BP)
XXIV:23	Awards given local media for school coverage
XXVI:4	No. of special sources for outside advice
XXVI:6	No. of sources outside district for national criticisms heard locally*

Variables significantly correlated with acquiescence only (Positive)

I:6	No. of years superintendent taught in district
I:16	Superintendent's personal goal: administration outside education
II:34	Percent of students in honor society
IV:7	School relations with welfare organizations: coordination
XII:30	No. of informational publications for staff
XIII:2	Activities undertaken by parent groups
XIV:9	No fees for community use of school facilities
XV:35	1960 heterogeneity of income
XV:68	Ratio of 1950 percent employed in services to 1940 percent
XV:74	Ratio of 1950 percent employed in professions and administration to 1940 percent
XV:131	1960 mean-median age discrepancy
XV:190	Ratio of 1950 percent employed in construction to 1940 percent
XV:195	1960 percent of population attending school
XV:261	Ratio of 1950 percent employed in sales, clerical, and kindred to 1940 percent
XV:269	1960 ratio of resident workers to workers in area
XVI:8	Board meetings: media attendance permitted
XVII:18	Lack of organized opposition in last financial election
XVII:33	Conservative elements: religious
XX:12	Percent of Democrats in district
XXII:10	Board policy on teacher grievance
XXII:24	Years needed to change board majority
XXII:48	Area represented by board members: ward

Acquiescence, positive (Cont'd)

XXII:51	Understanding among board members**

Variables significantly correlated with acquiescence only (Negative)

I:49	Superintendent's educational goal: prepare children for citizenship
II:1	Invitational social clubs for students
V:52	Percent of grades 7-8 teachers with any degree
VIII:16	Teacher hiring: no. of people involved
XIII:16	Extent of parent group participation in financial election campaign
XV:59	Percent employed in manufacturing, 1960
XV:148	Ratio of 1950 ratio of district to state percent age 21 or over to 1940 ratio
XVII:14	Individual opposition use of public meetings
XIX:9	Opposition to school policy by business leaders
XXIV:11	No. of reporters regularly assigned to cover school news

Variables significantly correlated with participation only (Positive)

V:15	Overall individual teacher participation in school elections
V:30	Individual teacher participation in tax elections
V:31	Individual teacher participation in budget elections
XI:33	Salary increases emphasized in campaign (BP)*
XIII:14	Ratio of schools to parent groups

** This variable also has an artifactual (part-whole) relationship with the criterion of understanding.

Participation, positive (Cont'd)

XV:22	Ratio of district per family income to state per family income, 1960*
XV:105	Ratio of percent professional or technical to percent managers, officials, clerical, and sales, 1960
XV:187	Ratio of 1950-60 percent population increase to 1940-50 percent population increase
XV:191	Ratio of 1950-60 percent employed in construction ratio to 1940-50 ratio
XV:200	Ratio of district percent of total population with college education to state percent, 1960
XIX:3	Large taxpayers represented on board
XX:9	Opposition to school policy by agricultural groups
XXVI:7	No. of sources inside district for national criticisms heard locally

Variables significantly correlated with participation only (Negative)

II:16	No. of athletic events scheduled weekdays after school
II:33	Lack of high school dropouts
VII:11	Ratio of 1960 to 1950 pupil enrollment
VII:14	Ratio of 1960 to 1950 district population*
VIII:28	Discussion of evaluation with teacher
X:16	Business procedures: use of cost accounting
XIV:7	Citizen questions allowed at board meetings
XV:30	Ratio of 1950 per capita retail sales to 1940 per capita retail sales
XV:114	Ratio of 20-29 age group in 1960 to 10-19 age group in 1950*
XV:181	1960 percent born in Latin America
XV:184	Percent population increase, 1950-60

Participation, negative (Cont'd)

XV:206	Ratio of district percent of total population with high school education to state percent, 1960
XV:270	Ratio of 1960 ratio of resident workers to workers in area to 1950 ratio
XVI:1	Major social event to which parents invited: academic
XVII:23	Organized opposition use of public meetings
XVII:34	Conservative elements: reactionary
XXII:8	No. of board members with children
XXIII:18	Transportation service to polls by citizens' committee

Significant Correlations With Two Criterion Variables

Positive with understanding and negative with quiescence

I:29	Implementation of board decisions: superintendent reaction to accomplished change
XV:194	Ratio of percent of population in annexed area to percent population increase, 1950-60
XX:21	Support on school issues by labor unions
XXIV:8	Mass media support of schools in last election

Negative with understanding and positive with quiescence

XV:230	Ratio of 1960 district to state mean educational level ratio to 1950 district to state ratio

Negative with understanding and negative with quiescence

XIV:2	Board contact with public*
XV:9	Extent of neighborhood factions
XVI:3	No. of special interest groups attending board meetings*
XXIII:1	Citizens' committee on school affairs

Positive with understanding and positive with acquiescence

I:31	Superintendent reaction to proposed change
XV:44	Ratio of district mean-median income discrepancy to state mean-median discrepancy, 1960*

Negative with understanding and positive with acquiescence

XV:46	Ratio of 1960 ratio of district to state mean-median income discrepancy to 1950 ratio

Negative with understanding and negative with acquiescence

XVII:8	Individual criticism of expenditures (O)
XVII:9	Individual criticism of tax level (O)
XVII:11	Individual criticism of board (O)
XVII:35	No. of organized critic groups (S)
XVII:37	Organized opposition use of last minute attacks*
XXII:16	Board educational goal: prepare children for citizenship
XXII:53	No. of situations where board disagrees*

Positive with understanding and negative with participation

X:13	Property assessment: selection of assessor locally*
XII:22	Information procedures for teachers
XII:23	Information procedures for parents

Negative with understanding and positive with participation

XI:28	No. of unanswered citizen questions in campaign
XVII:46	Individual criticism of teacher capability (BP)

Positive with quiescence and positive with acquiescence

I:47	Superintendent-board understanding**
VIII:22	Teacher dismissal: immediate firing (S)
XV:47	Percent employed in agriculture, forestry, and fishing, 1960
XV:104	1960 percent farm laborers and foremen

Negative with quiescence and negative with acquiescence

VIII:2	Teacher salary: ratio of highest to lowest, grades 7-8*
VIII:27	Evaluation shown to teacher
XI:9	Use of telephones to increase voter registration*
XI:29	Extent of emphasis on needs in campaign (P)*
XI:30	Duration of tax levy extension*
XV:11	No. of communities within district
XXII:3	Average educational level of board members

Negative with quiescence and positive with participation

XVII:50	No. of organized critic groups (BP)

Negative with quiescence and negative with participation

I:21	Communication with power structure
VII:10	Ratio of 1950 to 1940 pupil enrollment
XIII:1	Parent representation at state PTA meetings
XV:60	Ratio of district percent employed in manufacturing to state percent employed in manufacturing, 1960
XV:89	Ratio of 1960 reciprocal of percent living in different house than previous year, within county, to 1950 reciprocal*

** This variable is artifactually correlated (part-whole relationship) with understanding.

Positive with acquiescence and positive with participation

V:36	Individual teacher campaign participation: public discussions

Positive with acquiescence and negative with participation

I:24	Superintendent's social contacts with power structure
I:55	Administrator-teacher relations: staff morale(S)
VII:9	District dependence on federal aid
XV:192	Ratio of annexed area in the decade 1950-60 to area in 1950
XXV:9	Percent of district operating income from state aid

Negative with acquiescence and positive with participation

X:12	Budget reviewing agency: no. of other functions
XI:2	Salary increases emphasized in campaign (S)*
XV:125	1960 median age*

Significant Correlations With Three Criterion Variables

Positive with understanding and acquiescence, negative with participation

I:22	Agreement with power structure

Negative with understanding, quiescence, and acquiescence

XI:24	Extent of emphasis on needs in campaign (S)*
XV:10	No. of specific rivalries among neighborhood factions*
XVII:41	Organized opposition use of letters to newspapers*
XVII:48	Individual criticism of tax level (BP)
XXII:12	Average time devoted to board business by board members

Negative with quiescence and acquiescence, positive with participation

XI:12 Use of letters and postcards to get out parent vote*

Significant Correlations with Four Criterion Variables

Negative with understanding, quiescence, acquiescence; positive with participation

XI:6 Disagreement among school representatives in campaign

XVII:49 Extent of individual criticism of schools (BP)*

Appendix A

Instruments

- Superintendent questionnaire
- Board president questionnaire
- Board member questionnaire
- Parent representative questionnaire
- Teacher representative questionnaire
- Mass media representative questionnaire
- Interested citizen questionnaire
- Factual questionnaire #1
- Factual questionnaire #2
- Inventory

Project: CAST
Superintendent Interview

Stanford University

District: ____________________

Name: ____________________________ Address: __________________________

Age: _____ yrs.

Years as: superintendent in district: _____yrs.
superintendent elsewhere: _____yrs.
administrator (other) in district: _____yrs.
administrator (other) elsewhere: _____yrs.

Teaching experience:
_____yrs. in district
_____yrs. elsewhere

Degrees held: _____ _____ _____ _____

---

1. Have you held, or do you now hold, any elected office in a professional educational organization? (No:_____)

Office	Organization

2. Have you been, or are you now, a member of an appointed statewide group concerned with an educational problem? (No:__)

group	problem

3. Of what local, nonprofessional organizations are you a member? (None:_____)
   (For each, ask: Have you held, or do you now hold an office in the organization?)

organization	office held

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

4. (Response group 1) To what extent do you go to each of the following kinds of persons for advice or assistance:

   a. county educational officials?___ (Not applicable:___)
   b. the state department of education?___
   c. college or university staff members?___
   d. neighboring district officials?___

5. (Response group 1) To what extent do you get together with each of the following kinds of persons in order to coordinate mutual interests or activities:

   a. county educational officials?___ (Not applicable:___)
   b. the state department of education?___
   c. college or university staff members?___
   d. neighboring district officials?___

6. (Response group 1) In terms of your personal goals, how much do you feel each of the following is a possible direction for you to go in your career:

   a. teaching in higher education?___
   b. administration outside education?___
   c. educational administration other than the superintendency?___
   d. superintendency in another district?___

7. (Response group 2) Assuming that these four purposes are goals of most schools, how would you rank them in importance? Which would you say is the most important?...

   Rank: A_____; B_____; C_____; D_____.

8. (Response group 3) To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

   a. Teachers should take loyalty oaths before being allowed to teach.___
   b. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions outside the classroom on any subject.___
   c. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions inside the classroom on any subject.___
   d. Staff members should not participate in party politics.___
   e. Any group, representing any viewpoint, should be able to use school facilities for a public meeting.___
   f. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important political ideologies in school.___
   g. Schools should provide released time for pupils to have religious instruction.___
   h. Public funds should be used to provide transportation for parochial school pupils.___
   i. Religious groups should be able to use school facilities for private social purposes.___
   j. Federal aid should be given parochial schools to help support the secular parts of their programs.___
   k. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important religious ideologies in school.___

9. (Response group 1) When a problem in district policy arises, to what extent are you likely to talk over the situation with each of the following:

   a. local business leaders?___
   b. local professional leaders?___
   c. local civic club leaders?___
   d. local civic officials?___
   e. prospective opposition leaders?___
   f. local parent group leaders?___

10. (Response group 1) With each of these types of persons, to what extent are you usually able to reach a satisfactory agreement: ("O" if not applicable)

    a. local business leaders?___
    b. local professional leaders?___
    c. local civic club leaders?___
    d. local civic officials?___
    e. prospective opposition leaders?___
    f. local parent group leaders?___

11. Of the six types of persons just mentioned, are there any you would not care to go against if they opposed a proposed district policy? (Check those applicable)

    a_____; b_____; c_____; d_____; e_____; f_____.

12. (Response group 1) Outside the performance of your duties, to what extent do you associate with each of the following types of persons:

    a. persons recognized as the local social leaders?___
    b. persons recognized locally as politically powerful?___
    c. persons of personal wealth locally?___
    d. persons heading large local businesses?___

13. (Response group 1) To what extent do the same persons constitute these four groups in your district?___

14. (Response group 1) To what extent is informal advice on school policy given the district by representatives of each of these groups: ("O" if not applicable)

    a. religious organizations?___
    b. labor unions?___
    c. agricultural organizations?___
    d. city officials?___
    e. business and industry?___

15. Do you have any student clubs whose purposes are primarily social?

    Yes___; No ___ (If none, skip to question 18)

16. Is the membership in any of these clubs solely by invitation?

    Yes___; No___.

17. (Response group 1) To what extent do you feel that the goals of the local student social clubs are inconsistent with those of the educator?___

18. In what ways does the school district find itself engaged in welfare activities for its pupils? (None:___)

______________________ ________________________________

19. (Response group 4) How would you characterize the relations between the school district and local welfare agencies?___

(If other than "very good," ask: Are there any specific problems?)

20. (Response group 1) As far as planning goes, to what extent are your pupils involved in each of the following:

a. dramatic presentations by pupils?___
b. debates and forums including pupils?___
c. rallies and pep meetings?___
d. outside speakers?___

21. (Response group 1) To what extent do your pupils participate in each of these:

a. dramatic presentations?___
b. musical presentations?___
c. debates and forums?___
d. exhibits and demonstrations?___
e. rallies and pep meetings?___

22. Is there a student newspaper published in the district? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: Is it (Are they) published as a class exercise or as an extra-curricular activity?)

Class_____; Extracurricular_____.

23. What student services, if any, does your district share with local parochial schools? (None:___)

______________________ ________________________________

24. What local non-school events do district pupils participate in as representatives of the schools? (None:___)

______________________ ________________________________

25. In what kinds of contests or other events does the district not allow school representation by its pupils? (None:___)

______________________ ________________________________

26. What is the district policy on corporal punishment? (None:___)

27. In what ways do pupils participate in determining punishments? (None:___)

28. Have there been any accidents involving pupil transportation in your district in recent years? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: What happened? When?)

29. (Response group 1) When your athletic teams have a losing season, to what extent can you expect criticism from local citizens?___

30. In recent years, has the district made any substantial changes in teaching methods? (No:___)

If yes, ask: What were the changes? When?)

______________________________ change made ______________ when

31. With respect to what teaching methods has there been some citizen controversy in your district in recent years? (None:___)

______________________ ______________________

32. Are parent-teacher conferences scheduled with all parents in this district? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: How often?______________ times per year, and also ask...

a. What preparation do your teachers receive for these conferences? (None:___)

b. What information about conference procedures is provided parents? (None:___)

33. What special provisions are made for the teacher of the gifted child in this district? (None:___) (Not applicable:___)

34. What special provisions are made for the teacher of the retarded child in this district? (None:___) (Not applicable:___)

35. What persons are officially involved in the selection of a new teacher? (By position)

______________ ______________ ______________

36. What public services have district school personnel contributed to their community -- apart from their regular assignments? (None:___)

______________________ ______________________

37. Are new maintenance staff members oriented to major school policies? In what way? (No:___)

38. Do you have in-service training for the maintenance staff? What is included? (No:___)

39. Are members of the maintenance staff represented formally in any of these ways: (Check those applicable)

    a. on an advisory committee of the school board?___
    b. on an administrative council?___
    c. at board meetings?___

40. (Response group 4) How satisfactory do you find the work of staff members involved in maintenance of buildings and facilities?___

41. (Response group 1) To what extent would you expect members of the staff -- as a whole -- to volunteer support if the administration were criticized?___

42. Specifically, are there any recent examples of such support from the staff that you can recall? (None:___)

43. (Response group 4) How would you evaluate your relationship with the teaching staff on each of these factors:

    a. considering teacher morale?___
    b. putting teacher suggestions to use?___
    c. allowing teachers freedom in procedures?___

44. In recent years, have any members of the school staff achieved -- or tried to achieve -- elected public office? (No:___)

    (If yes, ask: Has this created any problems for the district?)

45. (Response group 5) Suppose that a poor teacher would not resign. Which of these alternatives would be the most likely action of the district?____ Are any of the other alternatives likely to be used in this district?

    ______ ______ ______ ______

46. What means do you feel are effective in your district for holding down the turnover of teachers?

    ____________________ ____________________

47. On what basis are budget estimates made for the district?

48. On what date are budget preparations begun?____________

49. On what date is the budget submitted for approval?___________

50. Who makes the final decision on the school district budget? (Check one below)

    the voters___(if voters, skip to question 54)
    the school board___(if board, skip to question 54)
    a local municipal agency___; a county agency___;
    state agency___.

51. Does the reviewing agency have any of these powers: (Check those applicable)

a. to reject the budget and return it to the school board only?___
b. to change the total expenditure only?___
c. to change any part of the budget, such as a line item?___

52. Is the reviewing agency appointed or elected?

appointed___(if appointed, ask: By whom?____________)
elected___(if elected, ask: Does the agency represent an electorate which is:
larger than the school district?___
smaller than the school district?___
the same size as the school district?___

53. What other public functions does the agency have? (None:___)

____________________ ________________________

54. Before the budget comes up for adoption, is there a special public meeting held at which the budget is discussed? yes____; no____.

55. Who designates property assessors for the district?__________

56. Are district assessments reviewed by an assessor designated by some other governmental agency? By whom? (No:___)

____
agency designating review assessor

57. Is a recognized business system of cost accounting used in the district? (No:___)

(If yes, identify:________________)

58. Does the district have a policy that defines the conditions under which school purchases should be made from local merchants? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: What are these conditions?)

59. How many estimates must the district obtain before purchasing items which do not require formal bids?____________________
no. of estimates

60. Does the district have to work within a tax limit for a group of local agencies of which the school district is only one? (No:___)
(If yes, ask: With what other agencies?)

______________________ ______________________

61. Does the district have to work within a bonding limit for a group of local agencies of which the school district is only one? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: With what other agencies?)

____________________ ____________________

62. What restrictions on tax levy extensions affect the district? (Ascertain source of restriction) (None:___)

____________________ restriction ____________________ source

63. Are you required to hold district financial elections in conjunction with regularly scheduled city, state, or national elections? (Yes:___)

(If no, ask: Do you have a preference for when to call an election? When? Why?)

64. (Response group 1) To what extent would you say that you have disagreements among members of the district board of control?_______

65. What situations usually bring about the most obvious disagreements among board members?

66. (Response group 1) When you as superintendent put a major proposal before the board of control, to what extent is the district board likely to respond in each of these ways:

a. refer it to a board advisory committee for recommendation?___
b. hold a special public meeting to discuss it?___
c. discuss it with civic leaders?___
d. make an immediate decision?___

67. (Response group 1) To what extent would you say that neighborhood factions exist in this district?____

68. Are there any specific kinds of rivalry between neighborhoods that you can identify for us? (No:___)

____________________ ____________________

69. Do any other school districts overlap yours? Which ones?

____________________ ____________________ (None:___)

70. Has there been any controversy in the district concerning consolidation plans? (None:___)
(Not applicable:___)

(If yes, ask: What were the issues?)

72. Has the district made any long range studies of specific problems? Of what problems? (No:___)

____________________ ____________________

73. Does the district have a master plan? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: Does the plan carry you up to saturation?_____; ____)
yes no

74. From what non-educational sources does the district receive consultation:

a. on a regular basis? on what matters?

b. on a special basis? on what matters?

75. Are formal representatives of any of these groups presently members of the district board of control?

a. religious organizations? yes___; no___.
b. labor unions? yes___; no___; not applicable___.
c. agricultural organizations? yes___; no___; not applicable__
d. business organizations? yes___; no___.

Ascertain the largest taxpayers in the district.

1.__________________ ___________________________; 2.; 3; 4; 5.
name represents

76. Would you tell us, for each of these taxpayers, whether they are associated with the district in any of these ways: (Check where applicable)

TAXPAYER:

	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5
a. as a board member now	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. as an informal advisor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. as member of formal advisory board	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. as a philanthropist	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. as absentee landlord	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. as an opponent of school policies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

---

77. (Response group 1) To what extent is each of these types of conservative opinion evident among citizens in this district?

a. traditional conservatism?___
b. economic conservatism?___
c. political conservatism?___
d. religious conservatism?___
e. reactionary conservatism?___

78. (Response group 1) To what extent is opposition to school policies to be found among representatives of each of these groups:

a. religious organizations?___
b. business organizations?___
c. civic officials?___
d. labor unions?___ (Not applicable:___)
e. agricultural organizations?___ (Not applicable:___)

79. Is there any other organized opposition to school policies in the district -- such as from taxpayer groups or apartment owner groups? (No:___)

(If yes, identify below using these questions:

a. On what is group membership based -- e.g. apartment owners?
b. What state or national affiliation does it have?

membership criterion	affiliation

80. (Response group 1) In your estimation, to what extent are national criticisms reflected in local criticisms about each of these areas:

a. what is being taught?___
b. how things are being taught?___
c. student performance?___
d. administration of the schools?___
e. teacher capability?___
f. school expenditures?___
g. the level of taxes?___

81. Excluding mass media, who are the outside sources from whom these national criticisms appear to be getting into your district?

________________________ ________________________

82. Within the district, who spreads these criticisms?

________________________ ________________________

83. What is the major social event of the school year, sponsored by the schools, to which parents are invited?

84. (Response group 4) How good is the relationship between local parent groups and district officials?_________

(If other than "very good", ask: Have there been any specific problems?)

Ascertain most recent district financial election (bond, tax, budget).

Date of election:__________________Type:____________________

Skip to question 93 if no financial elections of any type are held in district.

85. (Response group 1) During the last election campaign, to what extent did the schools emphasize each of the following: ("0" if not applicable)

    a. rising enrolments?___
    b. crowded conditions?___
    c. salaries need to be increased?___
    d. poor condition of buildings and facilities?___
    e. rising costs of construction?___
    f. quality of instruction?___

86. (Response group 1) Among school representatives, to what extent was there any disagreement in the last financial election campaign about these factors:

    a. need for the proposed request?___
    b. the amount of the request?___
    c. the timing of the election?___
    d. the nature of the campaign to be waged?___
    e. the value to be stressed in the campaign?___

87. In your last election campaign, did you try any of these tactics:

    a. increasing overall voter registration? (No:___)
        i. by use of letter or postcard?___; from whom?___
        ii. by use of telephone?___; who called?___
        iii. by personal contacts?___; by whom?___
        iv. by speeches?___; by whom?___
    b. (Did you try) focusing on getting votes of parents of children in school? (No:___)
        i. by use of letter or postcard?___; from whom?___
        ii. by use of telephone?___; who called?___
        iii. by personal contacts?___; by whom?___
        iv. by speeches?___; by whom?___
    c. (Did you try) focusing on finding only favorable voters? (No:___)
       (If yes, ask: Who made the contacts?)
    d. (Did you try) increasing voter turnout on election day? (No:___)
        i. by use of letter or postcard?___; from whom?___
        ii. by use of telephone?___; who called?___
        iii. by personal contacts?___; by whom?___

88. What endorsements did you feel were most important to get in the campaign? (None:___)

    ______________________ ______________________

89. In your last campaign, did you have professional consultation on campaign preparations or tactics? From whom? (No:___)

    ______________________ ______________________

90. Did the district have a campaign organization for the election? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: What staff members were included? In what way?)

______________________ (staff included)

______________________ (how included)

91. Were any of these techniques used by organized opposition to the last financial election: (Not applicable:___)

a. last minute attacks?___
b. attacks on personalities?___
c. endorsements by leading citizens?___
d. bringing irrelevant issues into the campaign?___
e. letters to the newspaper?___

92. Were any other techniques used by the opposition? What? (Not applicable:___) (No:___)

93. (Response group 1) To what extent, generally speaking, does the district get each of these kinds of coverage by local mass media:

a. personnel profiles?___
b. reports of official meetings?___
c. reports of new curriculum developments?___
d. progress reports on a regular basis?___

94. (Response group 1) To what extent, generally speaking, do the local mass media undertake each of these roles with respect to the district schools:

a. explaining school problems to the public?___
b. seeking both sides of controversies involving schools?___
c. telling the schools about public views on educational problems?___
d. stimulating public interest in schools?___

95. What policy does the district have with respect to the needs of competing mass media? (None:___)

96. What mass media attempt to give coverage to school news in this district? (Specify by name of medium)

1....10______________________

(Use numbers 1....10 for responses to questions 97 through 101)

97. Did any of these media give you their support during the last election campaign?

98. Have any of these media come to your support during a controversy involving the district?

99. Has there been any problem with any of the media because of a failure on their part to check stories with school officials? Which media? (No:___)

100. Are there any reporters regularly assigned to cover school news in the district? (No:___)

media no.	reporter's name

101. Apart from their media positions, do executives from any of these media hold positions of leadership in their community? (No:___)

media no.	executive's name	position of leadership

102. What do local community agencies contribute in the way of services to the school district? (Nothing:___)

agency	service contributed

103. In what areas have you experienced difficult relations with a local civic institution -- such as a library, for example? (None:___)

institution	area of difficulty

104. (Response group 1) To what extent does the district use public meetings for each of these purposes:

a. present school planning to citizens?___
b. discuss teaching methods?___
c. discuss curriculum?___
d. discuss potentially controversial issues?___
e. discuss controversial issues?___
f. to campaign for school financial issue?___

105. Has the district taken any measures which are designed to increase face-to-fact contact between staff members and the public? What? (No:___)

__________________ __________________________

106. Do you employ a staff member or a regular consultant who is a specialist in public relations? Which? (Check either if applicable) (Neither:___)

Staff member___; regular consultant___.
(If either, ask: Which of these jobs does he do for the district:

a. advise the superintendent?___
b. advise the board of education?___
c. administer the district information program?___
d. direct campaigns for financial issues?___
e. orient district staff members on public relations?___)

107. Has the district established any procedures to make it easier for citizens to communicate with the schools? What? (No:___)

_____________________ ___________________________

108. Are citizen letters published in any district publication?

Yes___; no___; not applicable (no publications)___.

109. Has the district had a survey made of citizen attitudes recently? (No:___)

(If yes, ask:
a. Who conducted the survey?___
b. Who were interviewed?___
c. How many were interviewed?___)

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Superintendent Interview
Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

Response group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

Response group 2:
A. Prepare children for problems of adult life
B. Prepare children for citizenship
C. Develop intellectual abilities of children
D. Give children sense of our cultural heritage

Response group 3:
1. Disagree strongly
2. Disagree somewhat
3. Undecided
4. Agree somewhat
5. Agree strongly

Response group 4:
1. Not good at all
2. Not very good
3. Fairly good
4. Pretty good
5. Very good

Response group 5:
A. Immediate firing
B. Build a case for not renewing contract
C. Suspension
D. Assign unpleasant duties
E. Retain and attempt to improve performance

Project: CAST
Board President Interview

Stanford University

District:________________________

Name:__________________________________ Address:_____________________

a. Sex:______

b. Age:______yrs.

c. Education:____________________
last grade completed

d. Years lived in school district:______yrs.

e. Years served on school board:_______yrs.

f. Teaching experience:
(Check if any) by self:___
by spouse:___

g. Children's school experience:
(No children:___)

Public school
local___; other___
Private school
local___; other___

---

1. How many hours each week, outside of regularly scheduled meetings, do you personally spend on board business?___hrs.

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET.

2. (Response group 1) To what extent do you, personally, get information on how the public feels about the local schools by each of these means:
    a. conversations with people outside of board meetings?___
    b. informal conversations with people at board meetings?___
    c. receiving phone calls from citizens?___
    d. receiving letters from citizens?___
    e. reading the newspapers?___
    f. meeting with parent organizations?___
    g. meeting with groups of citizens?___

3. How many years would it ordinarily take to change the majority on the board?___yrs. Not applicable (board not elected):____

4. When a board vacancy occurs before the end of a term of office, how is it filled?

5. In recent years, have there been any moves to recall a board member in this district? When? What was the outcome?
(No:___)

_______________ when
________________________ outcome

6. At an average board meeting, about how many citizens attend who are not employed by the schools?___

7. What special interest groups are regularly represented at board meetings? (None:___)

_______________ _______________

8. Is the agenda for the board meeting regularly published? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: Where does it appear? When?

_______________ where appears

_______________ days in advance of meeting

9. In what ways are board actions made available to the public? (None:___)

_______________ _______________

10. (Response group 1) To what extent do representatives of the local mass media follow a policy of checking stories about the schools with district officials?___

11. (Response group 1) In general, to what extent do the mass media in this school district exhibit these characteristics:

a. lack of responsibility?___
b. inaccurate reporting?___
c. unfavorable biases toward schools?___
d. a tendency to sensationalize school news?___

12. Have any incidents affected the school's working relationship with the mass media? What? (None:___)

13. At a regular board meeting, can a district citizen stand up at any time to give his opinion? (Yes:___)

(If no, ask: When can he give his opinion?)

14. At a regular board meeting, can a district citizen stand up at any time to ask a question for clarification? (Yes:___)

(If no, ask: When can he ask for clarification?)

Ascertain whether board maintains any standing advisory committees, composed at least in part of citizens. Yes:___; No:___.

If no, skip to question 17.

15. Which of the following tasks have been assigned to your advisory committee:

a. to analyze procedures used in other districts?___
b. to analyze only one proposal for conformation?___
c. to analyze several proposals and make a recommendation?___
d. to review needs of the district?___
e. to review policies of the district?___
f. to study specific problems in the district but make its own proposals?___
g. to study any problem it wants to?___

16. What areas have been undertaken by your advisory committee(s) recently?) (None:___)

______________________ ___________________________

____

Ascertain whether there is now or ever has been a citizens' committee in the district concerned with school matters.

District: ___never has had citizens' committee;
___had one, but does not have one now;
___has one now (temporary___; permanent___).

If district has never had a citizens' committee, skip to question 22.

17. How did the citizens' committee come into existence (Who started it? For what purpose?)

__________________ started by   _________________________________ purpose for which started

18. Which of these responsibilities did the citizens' committee undertake:

a. to analyze procedures used in other districts?___
b. to analyze only one proposal for confirmation?___
c. to analyze several proposals and make a recommendation?___
d. to review needs of the district?___
e. to review policies of the district?___
f. to study specific problems in the district and make proposals?___
g. to study any problem it wanted to?___

19. Did the citizens' committee participate in an election campaign? (No:___)
(If yes, ask: Did the citizens' committee participate as part of the school's campaign organization or on its own?
with schools:___; on its own:___.
Which of these means of participation were used:
endorsement of issues?___
mailouts?___
telephone canvassing?___
door-to-door canvassing?___
neighborhood coffee meetings?___
sponsorship of public meetings?___
transportation service to the polls?___
voter registration drive?___
baby-sitting service on election day?___

20. Apart from any election campaign activities, did the district citizens' committee publish any bulletins or reports? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: a. On a regular basis?___
b. Who received it?___
c. For what purposes?___

21. Apart from any election campaign activities, did the citizens' committee sponsor public meetings for any of these purposes:

    a. to present school planning?___
    b. to discuss teaching methods?___
    c. to discuss curriculum?___
    d. to discuss potentially controversial issues?___
    e. to discuss controversial issues in the district?___

22. (Response group 1) In your opinion, to what extent is each of the following being criticized by citizens of this district:

    a. what is being taught?___
    b. how things are being taught?___
    c. student performance?___
    d. administration of the schools?__
    e. teacher capability?___
    f. school expenditures?___
    g. the level of taxes?___

23. What local organizations, or groups of interested citizens, have concerned themselves with one or another of these areas? (None:___)

    ________________________ ________________________
    group or organization area of criticism

24. (Response group 2) How good would you say the local citizens' understanding is of these needs of the district:

    a. school building needs?___
    b. special service needs?___
    c. operational needs?___
    d. personnel needs?___

25. (Response group 1) Generally speaking, to what extent does the average citizen in this district take pride in his community?___

26. (Response group 1) More specifically, to what extent has there been organized activity by citizens in the district in each of these ways:

    a. beautifying the community?___
    b. emphasis on local history?___
    c. entering contests for civic recognition?___

27. What are some of the things that visitors are usually told about as those things local citizens are proud of?

    ___________________ ________________________

28. Are there two or more distinct communities within the boundaries of the district? (No:___)

(If yes, identify:____________ ________________

(and ask: a. (Response group 2) What kind of a relationship exists between communities in the district?______

b. What beside the schools do these communities share?__________________

29. (Response group 1) To what extent are there definite neighborhoods in the school district, based on each of these characteristics:

a. nationality of origin?___
b. race?___
c. geographic features?___
d. religion?___

30. Are there any organized efforts to coordinate neighborhoods in the district? What are they? (No:___)

____________________ ____________________

31. What actions related to school issues has a local Chamber of Commerce taken in recent years? (None:___)

____________________ ____________________

32. What actions related to school issues has a local civic club taken in recent years? (None:___)

____________________ ____________________

33. What actions related to school issues has a local labor union taken in recent years? (None:___)
(Not applicable:___)

____________________ ____________________

34. What actions related to school issues has a local agricultural organization taken in recent years? (None:___)
(Not applicable:____)

____________________ ____________________

35. What actions related to school issues has a local religious group taken in recent years? (None:___)

____________________ ____________________

36. What actions related to school issues has a local civic official or group of officials taken in recent years?
(None:___)

____________________ ____________________

37. Has the district ever been formally investigated by an official body? By whom? What was the investigation of? What was the outcome? (No:___)

______________	________________________	__________
conducted by	subject of investigation	outcome

38. (Response group 1) To what extent do local employers seem to be satisfied with products of the district schools?___ (Not applicable:___)
(If other than "very much," ask: Have there been any specific criticisms?

____________________ ____________________

39. (Response group 1) In your opinion, to what extent does the average citizen take pride in the district schools?___

40. (Response group 1) More specifically, to what extent has there been civic pride evidenced in the schools by each of these:

a. beautifying the buildings and grounds?___
b. award banquets for students?___
c. formal recognition of staff members?___
d. donations to the schools?___

41. (Response group 2) How would you evaluate your superintendent on each of the following characteristics:

a. as a public speaker?___
b. in personal appearance?___
c. in supervisory roles?___
d. in initiating changes?___
e. in coordination of personnel?___
f. in evaluating staff performances?___
g. in mediating between factions?___
h. in planning ahead?___
i. in analyzing problems?___
j. in considering staff morale?___

42. (Response group 1) When the superintendent is criticized by someone in the audience at a board meetings, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. show a sense of humor?___
b. become irritated?___
c. try to postpone the subject until a later time?___
d. shift the blame if he can?___
e. accept the criticism even if it seems unwarranted?___

43. (Response group 1) When the superintendent finds himself in disagreement with a proposal from the board, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. try to find flaws in the proposal?___
b. try to postpone any decision for more evidence?___
c. bring pressures to bear on the board?___
d. accept the proposal without resistance?___

44. (Response group 1) When the board finally adopts a proposal with which the superintendent has been in disagreement, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

a. accept and implement it without question?___
b. drag his feet?___
c. try to find new flaws in the proposal?___

45. (Response group 1) If the board receives from a citizen's group a proposal for a change in district policy, to what extent is the board likely to respond in each of the following ways:

a. refer it to the superintendent for recommendation?___
b. refer it to a board advisory committee for recommendation?___
c. hold a special public meeting to discuss it?___
d. discuss it with civic leaders?___
e. make an immediate decision?___

46. (Response group 3) Assuming that these four purposes are goals of most schools, how would you rank them in importance? Which would you say is the most important?

Rank: A___; B___; C___; D___.

47. (Response group 4) To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

a. Teachers should take loyalty oaths before being allowed to teach.___
b. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions outside the classroom on any subject.___
c. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions inside the classroom on any subject.___
d. Staff members should not participate in party politics.___
e. Any group, representing any viewpoint, should be able to use school facilities for a public meeting.___
f. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important political ideologies in school.___
g. Schools should provide released time for pupils to have religious instruction.___
h. Public funds should be used to provide transportation for parochial school pupils.___

47. (Cont.)

i. Religious groups should be able to use school facilities for private social purposes.___
j. Federal aid should be given parochial schools to help support the secular parts of their programs.___
k. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important religious ideologies in school.___

Ascertain most recent financial election (bond, tax, budget).

Date of election:_______________ Type:____________________

Skip to question 49 if no financial election of any kind is held in district.

48. (Response group 1) During the last election campaign, to what extent did the schools emphasize each of the following: ("O" if not applicable)

a. rising enrollment?___
b. crowded conditions?___
c. salaries need to be increased?___
d. condition of buildings and facilities?___
e. rising costs of construction?___
f. quality of instruction?___

---

49. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Board President Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

Response group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

Response group 2:
1. Not good at all
2. Not very good
3. Fairly good
4. Pretty good
5. Very good

Response group 3:
A. Prepare children for problems of adult life
B. Prepare children for citizenship
C. Develop intellectual abilities of children
D. Give children sense of our cultural heritage

Response group 4:
1. Disagree strongly
2. Disagree somewhat
3. Undecided
4. Agree somewhat
5. Agree strongly

Project: CAST
Board Member Interview

Stanford University

District:____________________

Name:_________________________________ Address:__________________

a. Sex:_________

b. Age:______yrs.

c. Education:____________________
last grade completed

g. Children's school experience:
(No. children:____)

d. Years lived in school district:___yrs.

e. Years served on school board:___yrs.

f. Teaching experience:
(Check if any)
by self:___;by spouse:___.

Public school
local___; other___
Private school
local___; other___

---

1. How many hours each week, outside of regularly scheduled meetings, do you personally spend on board business?___hrs.

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

2. (Response group 1) To what extent do you, personally, get information on how the public feels about the local schools by each of these means:

    a. conversations with people outside of board meetings?___
    b. informal conversations with people at board meetings?___
    c. receiving phone calls from citizens?___
    d. receiving letters from citizens?___
    e. reading the newspapers?___
    f. meeting with parent organizations?___
    g. meeting with groups of citizens?___

3. (Response group 1) If the board receives from a citizen's group a proposal for a change in district policy, to what extent is the board likely to respond in each of the following ways:

    a. refer it to the superintendent for recommendation?___
    b. refer it to a board advisory committee for recommendation?___
    c. hold a special public meeting to discuss it?___
    d. discuss it with civic leaders?___
    e. make an immediate decision?___

4. (Response group 2) Assuming that these four purposes are goals of most schools, how would you rank them in importance? Which would you say is the most important?

    Rank: A___; B___; C___; D___.

5. (Response group 1) When the superintendent is criticized by someone in the audience at a board meeting, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

   a. show a sense of humor?___
   b. become irritated?___
   c. try to postpone the subject until a later time?___
   d. shift the blame if he can?___
   e. accept the criticism even if it seems unwarranted?___

6. (Response group 1) When the superintendent finds himself in disagreement with a proposal from the board, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

   a. try to find flaws in the proposal?___
   b. try to postpone any decision for more evidence?___
   c. bring pressures to bear on the board?___
   d. accept the proposal without resistance?___

7. (Response group 1) When the board finally adopts a proposal with which the superintendent has been in disagreement, to what extent is he likely to exhibit each of the following reactions:

   a. accept and implement it without question?___
   b. drag his feet?___
   c. try to find new flaws in the proposal?___

8. (Response group 3) To what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

   a. Teachers should take loyalty oaths before being allowed to teach.___
   b. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions outside the classroom on any subject.___
   c. Teachers should be able to state their own opinions inside the classroom on any subject.___
   d. Staff members should not participate in party politics.___
   e. Any group, representing any viewpoint, should be able to use school facilities for a public meeting.___
   f. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important political ideologies in school.___
   g. Schools should provide released time for pupils to have religious instruction.___
   h. Public funds should be used to provide transportation for parochial school pupils.___
   i. Religious groups should be able to use school facilities for private social purposes.___
   j. Federal aid should be given parochial schools to help support the secular parts of their programs.___
   k. Pupils should be exposed to representatives of important religious ideologies in school.___

9. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Board Member Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

- -

Response group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

- -

Response group 2:
A. Prepare children for problems of adult life
B. Prepare children for citizenship
C. Develop intellectual abilities of children
D. Give children sense of our cultural heritage

- -

Response group 3:
1. Disagree strongly
2. Disagree somewhat
3. Undecided
4. Agree somewhat
5. Agree strongly

- -

Project: CAST
Parent Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

District:____________________

Name:______________________________ Address:____________________

Position now held as member of a parent organization (None:___)

____________________ position (if any)

____________________ organization

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

1. (Response group 1) To what extent is your local parent group represented at annual state meetings of the Parent-Teachers Association?___

2. (Response group 1) Generally speaking, to what extent would you say that your local parent group undertakes each of these activities:

   a. raising money for gifts to the schools?___
   b. welcoming new parents into the district?___
   c. presenting a public performance by group members, such as a show?___
   d. presenting an entirely social program for its members only?___
   e. sponsoring public meetings to present school planning?___
   f. sponsoring public meetings to discuss teaching methods?___
   g. sponsoring public meetings to discuss curriculum?___
   h. sponsoring public meetings to discuss potentially controversial issues in the district?___
   i. sponsoring public meetings to discuss controversial issues in the district?___

3. Does any parent club in the district publish a regular bulletin or report? (No:___)
   (If yes, identify:___________, and ask:

   a. How often does it appear?___
   b. Who receives it?___
   c. What purposes does it serve?___

4. (Response group 2) How good is the relationship between the local parent groups and district administrators?___
   (If other than "very good," ask: Have there been any specific problems?

   ______________________ ____________________

5. (Response group 2) How would you rate your district's procedures for responding to requests for information?___

   (If other than "very good," ask: What seems to be lacking?

   ____________________ ____________________

6. (Response group 2) How would you rate your superintendent's reaction to parents who want to talk to him?___

   (If other than "very good", ask: Have there been any specific problems?

   ____________________ ____________________

7. (Response group 2) How would you rate your average teacher's reaction to parents who want to talk about their children's problems?___

   (If other than "very good," ask: Have there been any specific problems?

   ____________________ ____________________

8. (Response group 2) How favorable a reaction would you expect to get from the district superintendent if a parent group asked for more participation in school matters?___

9. What specific opportunities now exist for parent groups to participate in determining school policies?

   ____________________ ____________________

10. (Response group 2) How good would you say the local citizen's understanding is of these district needs:

    a. school building needs?___
    b. special service needs?___
    c. operational needs?___
    d. personnel needs?___

Ascertain most recent financial election (bond, tax, budget).

Date of election:______________Type:______________

Skip to question 14 if no financial election of any kind is held in district.

11. At the time of the last financial election, were there any instances that you know of when a parent or some other citizen had difficulty getting an answer to some question? (No:___)

    ____________________ ____________________

12. Did any local parent organization participate in the election campaign? (No:___)
    (If yes, ask:
    a. Did the parent organization(s) participate as part of the school's campaign organization or on its own?
       with schools:___; on its own:___.
    b. Which of these means of participation were used:
       endorsement of issues?___
       mailouts?___
       telephone canvassing?___
       door-to-door canvassing?___
       neighborhood coffee meetings?___
       sponsorship of public meetings?___
       transportation service to the polls?___
       baby-sitting service on election day?___
       voter registration drive?___

13. (Response group 3) During the last election campaign, to what extent did the schools emphasize each of the following:
    ("O" if not applicable
    a. rising enrollment?___
    b. crowded conditions?___
    c. salaries need to be increased?___
    d. poor condition of buildings and facilities?___
    e. rising costs of construction?___
    f. quality of instruction?___

The information below is to be obtained for all five board members

Identification of Board Members: 1.___; 2.___; 3.___; 4.___; 5.___.

14. (Response group 3) We would like to have your evaluation of each of the district board members. First, for ___________, to what degree do you feel he is: name

	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5
a. tactful with the public?					
b. responsible?					
c. able?					

---

15. (Response group 3) How much of a problem is pupil conduct in the classroom for your district?___

16. (Response group 3) How much of a problem is pupil conduct outside of the classroom for your district?___

17. Are there any specific conduct problems, in or out of school, that have come to your attention recently? What are they? (No:___)

____________________ ____________________

18. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Parent Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

Response Group 1:

1. Not at all
2. Not very often
3. Sometimes
4. Pretty often
5. Very often

Response Group 2:

1. Not good at all
2. Not very good
3. Fairly good
4. Pretty good
5. Very good

Response Group 3:

1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

Project: CAST
Teacher Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

District:_________________

Name:_____________________________ Address:_______________________

Position now held in teacher organization: (None:___)

______________________ ______________________
position (if any) organization

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

1. (Response group 1) To what extent do you feel teachers in this district are generally satisfied with each of the following:

   a. general working conditions?___
   b. salaries?___
   c. job security?___
   d. academic freedom?___
   e. status in the community?___

2. (Response group 1) To what extent does district policy suggest off-the-job behavior for each of the following:

   a. not smoking in public?___
   b. not drinking in local establishments?___
   c. regular attendance at PTA meetings?___
   d. buying from local merchants?___
   e. regular attendance at a local church or synagogue?___
   f. not dating other teachers in the same school?___
   g. participation in local community activities?___

3. Do teachers in this district see a copy of written evaluations made of them?

   (Yes:___; No:___)

4. Does the person evaluating discuss his report with the teacher? (Yes:___; No:___.)

5. Does district policy allow teachers to go directly to board members with a grievance? (Yes:___) (No Policy:___) (If no, ask: What course is open?)

6. Do teachers participate in any way in the selection of new principals? How? (No:___)

7. Are teachers informed of district openings in administrative positions? How? (No:___)

8. Is there a pre-service training program for teachers who may become administrators in the district? (Yes:___; No:___)

9. In hiring teachers, does this district always require a personal interview? (Yes:___)
(If no, ask: What are the exceptions?)

____________________ ____________________

10. In hiring teachers, does this district always require a written examination? (Yes:___)
(If no, ask: What are the exceptions?)

____________________ ____________________

11. Are individual teacher salaries based on negotiation or on a schedule?
negotiation:___; schedule:___; both___; neither:___.
(If "both" or "neither", ask: How does it work?)

12. (Response group 1) To what extent do you feel that this district attempts to keep its salaries down by dismissing teachers before they get tenure?___

13. (Response group 1) To what extent, would you say, do budget recommendations in this district originate with the teachers?
___

14. In what ways do teachers in this district participate in the preparation of the yearly district budget? (None:___)

____________________ ____________________

15. (Response group 2) Generally speaking, how good would you say procedures are in this district for answering teacher questions?____
(If other than "very good," ask: Are there any specific problems?)

____________________ ____________________

16. Do teachers in the district participate in study groups or workshops on school problems? (No:___)

(If yes, ask:
a. Are meetings regularly scheduled each year?
(Yes:___; No:___)
b. What problems have been studied?
c. What is the policy on participation -- who can attend, who must attend?

Can attend	Must attend
____________________	____________________

17. Are district teachers presently represented on any of the following:

a. on an advisory committee of the board of education?___
b. on an administrative council?___
c. at board meetings?___

18. Is there a professional, non-union, organization for teachers in the district? (No:___)

(If yes, identify:______________________, and ask...
largest if more than 1

a. About what percentage of your teachers are members?___%
b. What economic benefits do members receive? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

c. In what negotiations does the organization represent teachers? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

d. Has the organization had any difficulties with the administration? What? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

19. Is there a union organization for teachers in the district? (No:___)

(If yes, identify:______________________, and ask...
largest if more than 1

a. About what percentage of your teachers are members?___%
b. What economic benefits do members receive? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

c. In what negotiations does the union represent teachers?

__________________ __________________ (None:___)

d. Has the union had any difficulties with the administration? What? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

20. Does the non-teaching staff have an organization of its own in the district? (No:___)
(If yes, identify: and ask...
a. In what negotiations does the organization represent the staff? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

b. Has the organization had any difficulties with the administration? What? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

21. What positions of leadership do district teachers presently hold in community affairs or organizations? (None:___)

__________________ __________________
position activity or organization

22. What contributions have teachers, as a group, made to community affairs? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

23. What support have teachers, as a group, given school leadership during controversy or crisis? (None:___)

__________________ __________________

24. (Response group 2) How would you evaluate your superintendent on each of the following characteristics:

    a. as a public speaker?___
    b. in personal appearance?___
    c. in supervisory roles?___
    d. in initiating changes?___
    e. in coordination of personnel?___
    f. in evaluating staff performances?___
    g. in mediating between factions?___
    h. in planning ahead?___
    i. in analyzing problems?___
    j. in considering teacher morale?___
    k. in putting teacher suggestions to use?___
    l. in allowing teachers sufficient freedom in procedures?___

25. (Response group 1) To what extent do you feel that the superintendent tends to take it out on the staff when the schools are criticized?___

26. (Response group 2) How would you characterize the relationship in this district between administration and teaching staff?___

    (Ask of everyone: Would you give us some examples of your reasons for that opinion?)

27. (Response group 3) Suppose that a poor teacher would not resign. Which of these alternatives would be the most likely action of the administration?___ Are any of the other alternatives likely to be used in this district?___

28. If a teacher is fired in this district, is there any provision for a formal hearing? Before whom? (No provision:___)

    ______________________________ (Not applicable:___)

    (If yes, also ask: Can a teacher appeal the hearing decision? To whom?) (No provision:___)

    ____

29. (Response group 1) How much of a problem is pupil conduct in the classroom for your district?___

30. (Response group 1) How much of a problem is pupil conduct outside the classroom for your district?___

31. Are there any specific conduct problems, in or out of school, that have come to your attention recently? What? (No:___)

    ____________________ ____________________

32. Do teachers in your district participate in school election campaigns as an organized group? (No:___)

(If yes, ask...
a. Has an organized group of teachers participated in any of these kinds of elections:
    board member election?___
    board recall election?___
    bond issue election?___
    tax election?___
    budget election?___
b. Which of these forms has teacher participation taken:
    contributing funds?___
    soliciting votes?___
    endorsing candidates?___
    endorsing financial issues?___
    public discussions?___
    campaign planning?___
    preparation of campaign materials?___

33. As individuals, do teachers in your district participate in school election campaigns? (No:___)

(If yes, ask...
a. Has an individual teacher participated in any of these kinds of elections:
    board member election?___
    board recall election?___
    bond issue election?___
    tax election?___
    budget election?___
b. Which of these forms has individual teacher participation taken:
    contributing funds?___
    soliciting votes?___
    endorsing candidates?___
    endorsing financial issues?___
    public discussions?___
    campaign planning?___
    preparation of campaign materials?___

The information below is to be obtained for all five board members.

Identification of board members: 1___; 2___; 3___; 4___; 5___.

34. (Response group 1) We would like to have your evaluation of each of the following board members. First, for ______ (name), to what extent do you feel he is:

	Board member:				
	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5
a. tactful with the public?					
b. responsible?					
c. able?					

---

35. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Teacher Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

Response Group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

Response Group 2:
1. Not good at all
2. Not very good
3. Fairly good
4. Pretty good
5. Very good

Response Group 3:
A. Immediate firing
B. Build a case for not renewing contract
C. Suspension
D. Assign unpleasant duties
E. Retain and attempt to improve performance

Project: CAST
Mass Media Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

District: ____________________

Name: ______________________________ Address: _________________________

Position held with medium: ___________ Medium: _______________________
name of medium

1. Are representatives of the mass media allowed to attend all meetings of the board of education in this school district? (Yes: ___)

   (If no, ask: What are the exceptions?)

   ______________________ ___________________________

2. Are there any meetings of the district board of education which the mass media can cover but are not allowed to report? (No: ___)

   (If yes, ask: What kinds of meetings?

   ______________________ ___________________________

3. Apart from board meetings, does the local school district make it difficult in any way for you to gather news about school matters? (No: ___)

   (If yes, ask: In what ways?)

   ______________________ ___________________________

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

4. (Response group 1) To what extent does it seem to you that major decisions in this school district are made informally and rubber-stamped at board meetings? ___

5. (Response group 2) Assuming that these four purposes are some of the objectives of most media, how would you rank them in importance? Which would you say is the most important?...

   Rank: A___; B___; C___; D___.

6. In the event of some controversy involving the local school district, does your ________ (medium) make an effort to calm things down? (No: ___)

   (If yes, ask: In what ways?)

   ______________________ ___________________________

7. Are there any joint school-media projects which your ______
medium
has cosponsored? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: What were they?)

____________________ ____________________

8. Has your ______, or some member of the staff, received any
medium
honorary awards for work in school affairs? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: When, What was it given for?)

________ ________ ______________
award year given for...

9. (Response group 1) To what extent do you feel it is your obligation to the public for you to keep a watchful eye on each of these:

a. the morals of school personnel?___
b. school expenditures?___
c. efficiency of operation in the schools?___
d. quality of instruction?___

10. Have there been any recent incidents which affected your working relationship with the local schools? (No:___)

(If yes, ask: What happened? How did it affect things?)

__________ ____________________
incident outcome of incident

11. Do local political parties take stands on issues concerning the schools?

yes___; no___.

12. Do local political parties endorse candidates for the board of education?

(If yes, check here:___, and ask: Do they contribute to campaign expanses? yes___; no___)

(If no, check here:___, and ask: Are candidates identified with political parties anyway? yes___; no___)

13. About what proportion of the voters in this district are Republicans and what proportion are Democrats?

Republicans:___% Democrats:___%

14. (Response group 3) How did your last month's local commercial advertising revenue compare with that for the same month last year?___

    Can you give me the figures? 1961:____; 1962:____.
    (Identify here the figures used:____________________)

15. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Mass Media Spokesman Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

- -

Response Group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Somewhat
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

- -

Response Group 2:
A. Presenting the community's view to the schools
B. Presenting both sides of controversial school issues
C. Presenting discussions of general educational problems
D. Presenting the local schools to the community

- -

Response Group 3:
1. Much worse
2. Somewhat worse
3. About the same
4. Somewhat better
5. Much better

- -

Project: CAST Stanford University
Interested Citizen Interview

District:______________________

Name:_________________________________Address:____________________

Position now held as member of group interested in school matters: (None:___)

____________________ ____________________
position (if any) organization

---

1. Do you feel that the schools in this district are producing pupils who fit the needs of their local community? (Yes:___)

   (If no, ask: In what ways are they failing?)

   ____________________ ____________________

2. In your opinion, is undue emphasis being placed on any part of the local district curriculum? What? (No:___)

   ____________________ ____________________

Explain use of RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

3. (Response group 1) In your opinion, to what extent is each of the following being criticized by citizens of this district:

   a. what is being taught?___
   b. how things are being taught?___
   c. student performance?___
   d. administration of the schools?___
   e. teacher capability?___
   f. school expenditures?___
   g. the level of taxes?___
   h. board of education members?___

4. Have any local organizations, or groups of interested citizens, concerned themselves with one or another of these areas? (No:___)

   (If yes, ask: Which area? What group?)

   ____________________ ________________________
   area of criticism group or organization

Ascertain most recent financial election (bond, tax, budget).

Date of election:___________Type:___________

Skip to question 8 if no financial election of any kind is held in district.

5. (Response group 1) During the last election campaign, to what extent did the schools emphasize each of the following:
(Use "O" if not applicable)
   a. rising enrollment?___
   b. crowded conditions?___
   c. salaries need to be increased?___
   d. poor condition of buildings and facilities?___
   e. rising costs of construction?___
   f. quality of instruction?___

6. Was there any organized opposition to the school's position in that election? By whom? (No:___)

   ____________________ ____________________

   (If yes, ask: Were any publications -- such as reports, bulletins, or letters -- sent out by these groups?

   ____________________ ____________________
   publication organization

   (Also ask: (Response group 1) To what extent did these groups make use of the following ways of presenting their position:

   a. newspaper advertisements?___
   b. radio advertisements?___
   c. television advertisements?___
   d. public meetings?___
   e. discussions on radio or television?___
   f. news conferences or news releases?___
   g. letters to newspapers?___

7. (Response group 1) To what extent did citizens acting as individuals make use of the following ways of presenting their opposition to the schools:

   a. newspaper advertisements?___
   b. public meetings?___
   c. discussions on radio or television?___
   d. news conferences or news releases?___
   e. letters to newspapers?___

---

8. Is there anything that strikes you as being particularly indicative of school-community relations in this district?

REMEMBER TO LEAVE INVENTORY WITH RESPONDENT

Project: CAST
Interested Citizen Interview

Stanford University

RESPONSE CATEGORY SHEET

Response Group 1:
1. Not at all
2. Not very much
3. Sometimes
4. Pretty much
5. Very much

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: CAST
Factual Questionnaire I

Stanford University
March 5, 1962

District:

GENERAL

For questions 1-4, use reporting date closest to October 31

---

1. Number of pupils in district: ______ ______ ______
   1940 1950 1960
2. Total population of district: ______ ______ ______
   1940 1950 1960
3. Area of district (sq. miles): ______ ______ ______
   1940 1950 1960
4. Grades served: ______ ______ ______
   1940 1950 1960

---

5. Dates of consolidations (if any): ______ ______ ______
6. Date of unification (if any): ______
7. County, city, municipality, etc. with which district is coterminous (if any): ________________ (please identify)
8. Total assessed valuation of property in district subject to taxation: $______ ______ ______
   1940 1950 1960
9. Ratio of assessed to market valuation: ______% ______% ______%
   1940 1950 1960
10. Per pupil expenditure: $______ $______ $______
    1940 1950 1960

Questions 11-15 refer to the current fiscal year, 1961-1962

11. Proportion of total district operating income to be received from federal government: ______%
12. Amounts to be received from federal government under:
    P.L. 874: $______
    P.L. 864: $______
    Vocational (Smith-Hughes et al): $______
13. Amount to be received from federal government under P.L. 815: $______
14. Proportion of total district operating income to be received from state government: ______%

15. Amounts to be received from state government under:
flat grant, general purpose: $______
flat grant, special purpose: $______
equalizing grant, general purpose: $______
equalizing grant, special purpose: $______

BONDING

1. Legal limitation on bonding capacity: ____% of assessed valuation
(If none, check here:___)
2. Present level of bonding: ____% of assessed valuation
3. Voter authorization of bonding needed: ____% of those voting
(If none, check here:___) (Other:____________)
specify

Record of bond elections from Jan. 1, 1948 through Dec. 31, 1961:

Date	Amount	Result	Votes: For	Against	No. of Eligible Voters
________	$________	________	____	________	________
Month, Year		pass/fail	No.	No.	No.
________	$________	________	____	________	________
________	$________	________	____	________	________
________	$________	________	____	________	________
________	$________	________	____	________	________

TAXING FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS (ONLY)

1. Minimum tax levy on assessed valuation required: ____ mills (or:_________)
specify

2. Minimum tax levy on assessed valuation suggested: ____ mills (or:_________)
specify

(IF NEITHER OF ABOVE, CHECK HERE:____)

3. Maximum tax levy on assessed valuation allowed without voter approval: ____mills (or:_________)
specify

4. Maximum tax levy on assessed valuation allowed with voter approval: ____mills (or:_________)
specify

5. Present tax levy: ____mills (or:_________)
specify

6. Voter authorization needed to raise tax limit: ____% of those voting (Other:__________)
specify

Record of tax elections from Jan. 1, 1948 through Dec. 31, 1961:

				Votes:		
Date	Amount	Duration	Result	For	Against	Eligible Voters
Month, Year	mills	years	pass/fail	No.	No.	No.

BOARD OF CONTROL

Appointed boards:

1. Board members appointed by:____________________________________
2. Term of office for members:____yrs.

Elected boards:

1. Term of office:____yrs.
2. Frequency of board elections: every____yrs.
3. Candidates nominated by:____
4. Area represented by members: (Check one)
   ___district at large
   ___ward (or other district segment)
5. Requirement for date of election:____________________
   (check here if none:___)
6. Voter turnout at board elections from Jan. 1, 1948 through Dec. 31, 1961:

Date of election	No. of eligible voters	No. voting

BUDGETING

PLEASE SEND US A COPY OF THE 1961-62 BUDGET, INCLUDING ACTUAL EXPENDITURES MADE IN 1960-61 IN EACH BUDGET CATEGORY

1. Voter authorization of budget needed: ___% of those voting
(check here if none:___)

2. Agency authorization of budget needed: ______________
(Check here if none:___) Authorizing agency

Record of budget elections from Jan. 1, 1948 through Dec. 31, 1961:

		Votes:		
Year	Amount	For	Against	No. of Eligible Voters
______	$________	_____	_________	________________
______	$________	_____	_________	________________
______	$________	_____	_________	________________
______	$________	_____	_________	________________

INFORMANTS

We would like names and addresses for people who are in a position to know about school-community relations in your district. In several cases, your judgment will be required.

Position	Name	Address
Board President	______________	______________
Board Member*	______________	______________
Board Member*	______________	______________
Board Member*	______________	______________
Board Member*	______________	______________

*If more than five members, nominate those with longest tenure. List by tenure.

Teacher representative (elected, if available)	______________	______________
Parent representative (elected, if available)	______________	______________
Mass media representative (from medium which is most important in district)	______________	______________
Opposition representative (preferable from organized group)	______________	______________

Alternates (to be interviewed only if one of the above is unavailable):

Teacher representative ________________ ________________

Parent representative ________________ ________________

Mass media representative ________________ ________________
(Medium:________________)

Opposition representative ________________ ________________
(Org.:________________)

CONFIDENTIAL

Project: CAST
Factual Questionnaire II

Stanford University
May 1, 1962

District:____________________

---

1. Number of public schools in district:________

2. Total district attendance at Open House or Back-To-School functions during current school year (1961-62):____(If none held, check here:____; skip to Q. 4)

3. Activities included in Open House or Back-To-School functions: (Check all that apply)

   ___tour of physical plant
   ___demonstration class
   ___exhibits by pupils
   ___explanation of curriculum objectives
   ___explanation of district policies (other than curriculum)
   ___entertainment by pupils

4. Number of uses made by non-school groups of school buildings during 1960-61 school year:____

5. Total number of parent clubs or PTA groups in district:____

6. Total membership of parent clubs or PTA groups in district:___

---

7. Number of full time day teachers in district: (Combine part time teachers to make full time equivalents)

   grades K-6:___
   grades 7-8:___
   grades 9-12:___
   grades 13-14:___

8. Number of classroom teachers in these categories:

With	Grades: K-6	7-8	9-12	13-14
Ph.D or Ed.D degree	___	___	____	_____
M.A. or M.S. degree	___	___	____	_____
B.A. or B.S. degree	___	___	____	_____
No degree	___	___	____	_____

9. Number of teachers who left district at end of 1960-61 school year:

	Men	Women
grades K-6	___	_____
grades 7-8	___	_____
grades 9-12	___	_____
grades 13-14	___	_____

10. Average number of applications for teaching position in district for 1961-62 school year:___per opening.

11. Percentage of teachers residing within district boundaries: ___%

12. Number of principals in district who were formerly teachers in district:___

13. Number of full time personnel engaged in individual guidance and counseling activities with students:

(Combine part time personnel to make full time equivalents)

grades K-6:___
grades 7-8:___
grades 9-12:___
grades 13-14:___

14. Number of central office staff members (including custodians and secretaries):___

15. Number of central office staff certificated or holding either administrative or teaching credentials:___

16. Number of central office staff in these categories:

With Ph.D or Ed.D:____
M.A. or M.S.:____
B.A. or B.S.:____
No degree ____

---

17. Number of full time day pupils in district public schools: (As of reporting date closest to Oct. 31, 1961)

grades K-6:___
grades 7-8:___
grades 9-12:___
grades 13-14:___

*18. Number of full time day pupils in parochial schools within district: (As of Oct. 31, 1961)

grades K-6:___
grades 7-8:___
grades 9-12:___

*19. Number of 12th grade pupils graduating in district during 1961: (Check here if not applicable:___)

public school graduates:___
parochial school graduates:___

20. Number of pupils in district in honor society:___State
(Not applicable:___) ___National

21. Number of pupils participating in National Merit Scholarship tests in Spring of 1961:___ (Not applicable:___)

22. Number of pupils reaching semi-finals of National Merit Scholarship tests -- as reported in the Fall of 1961:___
(Not applicable:___)

* Only these two questions refer to parochial pupils. All other questions apply just to public school pupils.

23. Average percentile rank of district pupils on standardized achievement tests taken in 1960-61:

	National	State
Elementary:		
Spelling	________%ile	_____%ile
Reading	________%ile	_____%ile
Arithmetic	________%ile	_____%ile
Secondary:		
Mathematics	________%ile	_____%ile
Science	________%ile	_____%ile
Language arts	________%ile	_____%ile

24. Percentage of pupils who graduated from 8th grade in Spring, 1961, who entered 9th grade in Fall, 1961:___% (Not applicable:___)

25. Number of pupils who graduated from 12th grade in Spring, 1961, who in the Fall of 1961 entered: junior college:____ (Not applicable:___) 4 year college or university:____

---

26. Results of non-school bond or tax elections held since Jan. 1, 1960:*

Date	Type of election	Subject of Election	Results	Votes: For	Votes: Against
________	________	________	________	___	________
month/year	bond/tax	e.g., sewers	pass/fail	No.	No.
________	________	________	________	___	________
________	________	________	________	___	________
________	________	________	________	___	________
________	________	________	________	___	________

27. Current experimental programs: (If NDEA, asterisk, and indicate subject area)

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

28. Other innovations in program: (not primarily experimental)

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

29. Percentage of pupils assigned to special retarded child program:___% (If none, check here:___, and skip to Q. 32.)

* The school district may not be coterminous with, for example, a sewer or park district, or a municipality or county. Report elections for the county, municipality, or district which embraces most nearly the same area as the school district.

30. Purposes of retarded child program in district: (Check those that apply)

___social training
___vocational training
___training in personal care
___other:_________
specify

31. Means of identifying retarded child:
______________________ ______________________

32. Percentage of pupils assigned to special gifted child program:___% (If none, check here:___, and skip to Q. 35.)

33. Purposes of gifted child program in district: (Check those that apply)

___acceleration
___enrichment
___other:_________
specify

34. Means of identifying gifted child:
______________________ ______________________

35. Total enrollment in adult education classes, 1961-62 school year:______ (If none, check here:_____, and skip to Q. 38.)

36. Proportion of adult education program devoted to: (for 1961-62 school year)
high school credit:____%
citizenship training:____%
_____________________:____%
other (specify)
_____________________:____%
other (specify)

37. Sources of adult education program support: (for 1961-62 school year)
tuition: $______
local taxes: $______
state funds: $______
federal funds: $______

38. Total enrollment in summer school classes, 1961:______ (If none, check here:___, and skip to Q. 40.)

39. Purposes of summer school program: (Check those that apply)

___remedial
___acceleration
___enrichment
___leisure time activities
___other:_________
specify

----

40. What programs or activities are undertaken by the district in cooperation with each of the following groups:

a. Chamber of Commerce	b. Civic and service clubs
c. Civic institutions (e.g., libraries)	d. Welfare organizations
e. Religious organizations	f. Community as a whole
g. Agricultural organizations	h. Labor organizations

---

41. Expenditure for window breakage in 1960-61 school year: $_____

---

42. Audio-visual facilities (Check those applicable to district):

___slide projector(s)
___opaque projector(s)
___classroom(s) equipped for A-V
___television receiver(s)
___television broadcasting facility
___sound film projector(s)
___special audio-visual room(s)
___A-V library of instructional films
___closed circuit television
___radio broadcasting facility

---

43. School personnel assigned to public information program:

position (title)	% of full time
	%

44. Regular district informational publications: (not published by students)

title of publication	intended audience	times per year

45. Use of mass media (Check those applicable to district):

___news releases to media
___programs produced for radio or TV broadcast
___use of magazines in classroom work
___use of newspapers in classroom work
___news conferences with media
___use of educational TV in classroom work
___use of educational radio in classroom work

---

46. Community resource persons used in district classrooms (Check those applicable):

___fire department personnel
___local government personnel
___farm leaders
___physicians
___dentists
___police personnel
___business leaders
___social workers
___other:__________
specify

---

47. District transportation services (Check those applicable):

___student field trips within the district
___student field trips outside the district
___students participating in athletic events
___student spectators at athletic events
___students participating in non-athletic events
___student spectators at non-athletic events
___others without charge:___________ ___________ ___________
specify
___others with charge: ___________ ___________ ___________
specify

48. District counseling and guidance program (Check those applicable):

___individual cumulative records
___occupational information library
___interest (aptitude) inventories
___personality testing
___follow-up program for graduates
___follow-up program for non-graduates
___orientation (life-adjustment) classes
___research program(s) in guidance
___library of college catalogs
___intelligence testing
___achievement testing
___home visits by counselors
___homeroom counseling
___group counseling
___individual counseling
___in-service counselor training

49. District health program (Check those applicable):

___full time nurse for each school
___part time nurse for each school
___vision tests conducted
___regular physical exams
___immunization program
___health instruction in curriculum
___tuberculin testing
___health advisory council
___district safety coordinator
___hearing tests conducted
___regular dental exams
___cumulative health records
___dental instruction in curriculum
___X-ray examinations

50. Special services provided other than in guidance, health or transportation:

____________________ ____________________
____________________ ____________________
____________________ ____________________

---

* If a statement concerning grading policy is available for your district, please send us a copy, and a copy of the reporting form used.

---

51. Means of reporting pupil progress in district (Check those applicable):

___letter grades
___number grades
___other:__________
specify
___written report
___oral report

52. Basis for evaluation of pupil's progress (Check those applicable):

___pupil evaluated relative to norm for grade level
___pupil evaluated relative to classmates' progress
___pupil evaluated relative to own capacity
___other:__________
specify

53. Frequency of progress reports:____times per year.

---

* If a statement concerning promotion policy is available for your district, please send us a copy.

---

54. Procedures used in decision to retain child in grade (Check those applicable):

___decision solely by school personnel
___decision solely by school personnel, but parent is contacted
___school decision must be agreed to by parent
___decision solely by parent
___other:__________
specify

55. Percentage of students promoted in 1960-61 by grade level: (Not applicable:___)

Grade 1:___%
Grade 2:___%
Grade 3:___%
Grade 4:___%
Grade 5:___%
Grade 6:___%
Grade 7:___%
Grade 8:___%

---

56. Scheduled times for athletic events in district (Check those applicable):

	Weekday:			Saturday:		Other
	In school hours	After school	Night	Day	Night	(Specify)
Football	___	___	___	___	___	___
Basketball	___	___	___	___	___	___
Baseball	___	___	___	___	___	___
Track	___	___	___	___	___	___

---

* If a salary schedule is used in the district, please send us a copy.

---

57. Highest salary paid in district in 1961-62 to a full time teacher:

Grades 1-6: $______
Grades 7-8: $______
Grades 9-12: $______
Grades 13-14: $______

58. Lowest salary paid in district in 1961-62 to a full time teacher:

Grades 1-6: $______
Grades 7-8: $______
Grades 9-12: $______
Grades 13-14: $______

59. Average salary paid in district in 1961-62 to full time teachers:

Grades 1-6: $______ Grades 9-12: $______
Grades 7-8: $______ Grades 13-14: $______

60. Median salary paid in district in 1961-62 to full time teachers:

Grades 1-6: $______ Grades 9-12: $______
Grades 7-8: $______ Grades 13-14: $______

61. Criteria used in establishing a teacher's salary in district (Check those applicable):

___teaching experience in district
___teaching experience outside district
___academic degree
___units of work beyond degree
___military service
___extra duties
___non-teaching work experience
___merit ratings
___other:_________
specify

---

* If an organizational chart is available for the district, please send us a copy.

---

62. To whom are teachers directly responsible?________________

63. To whom are custodians directly responsible?______________

---

* If any teacher evaluation form is used in the district, please send us a copy.

---

64. Frequency of teacher evaluations for which written reports are filed:

Evaluations of first year teachers:___per year
Evaluations of second year teachers:___per year
Evaluations of third year teachers:___per year
Evaluations of teachers in 4th to 6th year of teaching:
___per year
Evaluations of teachers in 7th year of teaching or beyond:
___per year

---

* If rules governing use of school buildings by the public are available, please send us a copy.

----

65. Rules on public use of school buildings (Check those applicable):

___all use is free of charge
___can be used by any group
___can be used for any purpose
___can be used at any time (providing there is no conflict with pupil activities)

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
Stanford, California

School of Education Institute for Communication Research

...Research Project on Support for Public Education

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the U.S. Office of Education, we are asking several people in your community who are informed about local school-community relations to respond to this Inventory. You are one of 1800 persons throughout the United States who are being asked to help us with an important problem.

Stanford University has undertaken, in contract with the U.S. Office of Education, to explore the support of public education in the United States. We are trying to find ways which now -- or might in the future -- help to improve voter understanding and support for public schools.

You have been identified as a person who is in a position to know about relations between schools and community. You have been selected because you have a significant role in your community.

None of us questions the existence of an underlying value for the worth of public education. But, in the first results of our national survey of school-community relations, we see a number of factors which appear to be making a difference in how the schools and communities get along together. The following Inventory lists aspects of schools and communities which have made a difference in some -- but not necessarily all -- of the communities we have visited. We would like you to indicate those characteristics which are operative in your community.

The answers we receive will furnish a complete picture of present school-community relations in our nation. It is our intention to show the overall situation, and we will not embarrass in any way individuals or their communities. The information you give us will never be quoted above your name.

We are confident that our nation's schools will profit from such a comprehensive view of school-community relations. Your careful attention to this Inventory is appreciated.

This Inventory is prepared so that it may easily be returned to us. Merely fold the back cover over this front cover and seal. The postage is paid.

Sincerely yours,

William R. Odell
Project Director

Richard F. Carter
Associate Director

C ommunity
A nd
S chools
T ogether

...A Project of the U.S. Office of Education
Cooperative Research Program

District Code:_______________Respondent:____________________

THE STANFORD INVENTORY:

SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

We would like to have your estimate of the areas which might be helping or hurting the relationship that exists between your local schools and your community.

We have listed here areas which have been found important in some districts across the country. But in considering these areas, please apply them only to your own schools and your own community.

First, for each of these, determine whether the area is applicable in your district. If it is, determine whether it helps, hurts, or has no effect in how your schools and your community get along. If, as far as you know, this area has no effect upon the local situation, check the box under "No Effect" and go on to the next area.

For each of the areas which either helps or hurts the local school-community relationship, we would like to know how important this area is in determining the relationship. Is it of some importance or of great importance?

The examples below show how you should proceed....

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
a. Student behavior					x	
b. Teaching methods		x				
c. Federal aid to schools	No					

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
1. The school administrator as a school leader						
2. The school administrator's professional qualifications						
3. The school administrator's personal characteristics						
4. The school administrator's personal career goal						
5. The administrator's educational values						
6. The administrator's reaction to pressure						
7. The administrator's reaction to proposed change						
8. Relations between administrator and parents						
9. Administrator as community leader						
10. Student behavior						
11. Discipline policy						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
12. Teacher-pupil contact						
13. Student pride in schools						
14. Curriculum						
15. Summer school program						
16. Program for gifted						
17. Program for retarded						
18. Teaching methods						
19. Guidance and counseling services						
20. Health services						
21. Transportation services						
22. Other special services						
23. Grading policy						
24. Promotion policy						
25. Student athletics						
26. Student programs						
27. Student newspaper						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
28. Parochial schools						
29. Parent-teacher conferences						
30. Student achievement						
31. Success of students upon leaving school						
32. School use of community resources						
33. Students quitting before graduation						
34. Quality of teaching staff						
35. Quality of maintenance staff						
36. Staff morale						
37. Loyalty of staff to administration						
38. Relations between administration and teachers						
39. Teacher participation in school district election campaigns						
40. Teacher participation in community affairs						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
41. Teacher participation in district policy making						
42. School employees running for political office						
43. Staff organizations						
44. Salary policies for teaching staff						
45. Hiring of teaching staff						
46. Firing of teaching staff						
47. Organization of the staff						
48. Quality of central office staff						
49. Supervision of teachers						
50. Relations between administrator and non-teaching personnel						
51. Teacher behavior						
52. Promotional policy for staff						
53. Assignment of staff						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
54. Turnover of teachers						
55. District business procedures						
56. State fiscal requirements						
57. Federal aid to district						
58. State aid to district						
59. Administrator's relations with other educational officials						
60. District planning						
61. Preparation of the budget						
62. Adoption of the budget						
63. Type of school district						
64. Consolidation of district						
65. Unification of district						
66. Property assessment procedure						
67. Size of district						
68. Relations between administrator and school board						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
69. Relations within school board						
70. Selection of board members						
71. Characteristics of board members						
72. Public attendance at board meetings						
73. Relations between board and public						
74. Qualifications of board members						
75. Educational values of board members						
76. School board reaction to proposed changes from public						
77. School board reaction to proposed changes from administrator						
78. School board procedures						
79. Level of district wealth						
80. Distribution of district wealth						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
81. Sources of district wealth						
82. Stability of district wealth						
83. Stability of population in district						
84. Distribution of occupations in district						
85. Community holding power on youth						
86. Age of district population						
87. Racial composition of district population						
88. Size of district population						
89. Educational level of district population						
90. Relations between neighborhoods within the district						
91. Relations between communities within the district						
92. Student clubs						
93. School welfare activity						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
94. Degree of urganization in district						
95. Degree of geographic isolation						
96. Location of district in United States						
97. District dependence on government contracts or installations						
98. Degree of worker commuting outside district						
99. Political parties in district						
100. Large taxpayers in district						
101. Industrial and business leaders in district						
102. Chamber of Commerce						
103. Civic and service clubs						
104. Religious groups in district						
105. Civic officials in district						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
106. Labor unions in district						
107. Agricultural organizations in district						
108. Organized local critics of schools						
109. Individual local critics of schools						
110. National critics of education						
111. Advice from outside the district						
112. Turnout at school elections						
113. Citizen attitude toward taxes						
114. Citizen attitude toward business outlook						
115. Citizen pride in schools						
116. Citizen pride in community						
117. Citizen understanding of school needs						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
118. Citizen participation in school activities						
119. Conservative elements in district						
120. Citizen committees on school affairs						
121. Parent-Teacher Associations and parent clubs						
122. Advisory committee to school board						
123. Staff study groups or workshops on school problems						
124. Mass media (newspapers, radio, TV) attitude toward local schools						
125. Mass media coverage of school matters						
126. Relations between local mass media and schools						
127. Mass media executives as community leaders						
128. Mass media role in school-community relations						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
129. Responsibility shown in the local mass media						
130. Mass media as "watchdogs" of public servants and public moneys						
131. Competition among the mass media						
132. Timing of school financial elections						
133. Quality of school campaign presentation						
134. Needs emphasized during financial election campaign						
135. School campaign preparations						
136. Agreement among school representatives in financial election campaign						
137. Opposition campaign techniques						
138. Definiteness of tax levy extension						
139. Duration of tax levy extension						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
140. Adult education program						
141. Student participation in local events						
142. Community use of school facilities						
143. Services by school personnel for community						
144. Joint school and community programs						
145. Relations between schools and industry						
146. Official investigations of schools						
147. Services by community agencies for schools						
148. Relations between schools and civic institutions						
149. School information program						
150. School use of mass media						
151. School use of personal contacts with public						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
152. School use of public meetings						
153. School use of bulletins or reports to district						
154. Open house or Back to School nights						
155. School use of public relations counsel						
156. School use of letters and postcards in financial election campaign						
157. School use of telephones in financial election campaign						
158. School use of organized personal contacts in financial election campaign						
159. School use of speeches during financial election campaign						
160. Public meetings sponsored by PTA or parent club						

IN YOUR DISTRICT DOES THIS AREA:	APPLY?	HAVE NO EFFECT?	HELP local school-community relations..		HURT local school-community relations..	
			With Some Importance	With Great Importance	With Some Importance	With Great Importance
161. Bulletins published by PTA or parent club						
162. Campaigning in financial elections by PTA or parent club						
163. Public meetings sponsored by citizen committee						
164. Bulletins or reports published by citizen committee						
165. Campaigning in financial elections by citizen committee						
166. Public meetings sponsored by opposition to schools						
167. Bulletins or reports published by opposition						
168. Opposition use of mass media						
169. Communications from community to school						

Thank you for your assistance. Please fold the back cover over the front cover, seal it, and post to us.

Appendix B

Estimation Procedures For Demographic Variables

By

George Comstock

Estimation Procedures For
Demographic Variables

This study employs primarily the data on cities and counties published in the widely available decennial reports of the U. S. Bureau of the Census to determine the characteristics of populations in the 180 school districts.

Census tract data, which could be pooled under favorable circumstances, was not used. The circumstances were not favorable. District boundaries were difficult to define for either method, but harder for the use of tract data. However, economy of data collection was the prevailing consideration.

Not only do district boundaries vary from civil units used by the census, but the availability of data from the census on a given variable also varies from 1940 to 1950, or, 1960. Thus we have encountered problems both of area estimation and of variable estimation.[1]

In this memorandum, we shall describe the methods used in this study to solve both kinds of estimation problems. And, in a final tabulation, we shall report the districts surveyed in this study and the estimation procedures unique to them. (This last tabulation furnishes the only listing of districts studied.)

Area estimation

We questioned districts about the boundaries existing in 1960, to see if there was coterminality with one or more civil units (See Factual questionnaire #1). Failing coterminality, we then asked for further information in a following letter to the district.

---

[1] It should be noted that the term "variable" is used in this memorandum as descriptive of a set of variables reported in the body of this monograph. See Division XV.

For about two-thirds of the sample, we achieved a close fit with civil units. For the others, estimation procedures were necessary. In general, the problem was to estimate for districts smaller than an available civil unit, so that non-district data within the available unit could be eliminated -- especially insofar as it would be obviously different in character from that for the district. We wanted to attain homogeneity between the district and the larger unit from which its characteristics would be estimated, rejecting heterogeneous units from the larger unit.

Typically, this was achieved by using the county as a unit, but only after the urban units -- for which data was available -- had been subtracted. But other procedures were also used:

> For six districts, data for an urban unit and the rural population of its county were weighted in accord with information supplied by the district as to its urban-rural composition.
>
> For three districts, data for census units was weighted in accord with information supplied by the district as to its irregular geography.
>
> For one district, data for the county rural population was used alone because the county has most of its population in urban areas but no urban civil units were available in the census.
>
> For one district, data for the state rural population was used because the district includes parts of four rural counties.

These areas of best fit are labeled "primary census unit" in this report. When data on variables is not available through these procedures, further estimation procedures were adopted, resulting in the use of a "secondary census unit."

The problem of area estimation is somewhat tempered by the fact that availability is directly related to district size. Thus, estimation was more often necessary in smaller districts, where distortion possible as a result of omission was minimal.

For the nonresponding districts, we used a criterion to assess the goodness of fit: that the ratio of school enrollment to total population fall between one-third and one-sixth (the range of a distribution of such ratios for the other districts).

Table A gives the distribution of districts by two characteristics: area estimation procedure and goodness of fit. Each cell of this table is assigned a letter symbol, so that the form and fit of the estimation can be seen for a given district listed in the final tabulation.

We see from this tabulation that nearly two-thirds of the primary census units coincide with district boundaries at least to a degree of 95%. We also see that over 80% of the estimates were based on information from the district about boundaries and without weighting. As noted earlier, weighting was necessary in nine districts. And we did not have the cooperation of 23 districts in obtaining boundary information.

Table A. Area Estimation Procedure Classification.

	Goodness of fit:						
Estimation procedure	95-100%	75-95%	50-75%	25-50%	-25%	Not applicable*	Totals
Information supplied by district; nonweighted estimate used	A 98	B 17	C 3	D 12	D 18		148
Information supplied by district; weighted estimate used	F 6	G 1	H	I	J	P 2	9
No information supplied by district; nonweighted estimate used	K 13	L 4	M	N	O 6		23
Totals:	117	22	3	12	24	2	180

* District for which state or county rural data alone used, and for which goodness of fit criterion is not meaningful.

Variable estimation

The procedure for estimating data that is not available for a given variable at a given time is that of the ratio estimate. With data available on a given variable for a specified time, its character is estimated for the second time by solving the following equation:

$\frac{pcu^1}{scu_1} = \frac{pcu^2}{scu_2}$; where pcu^2 is the unknown data for the district's primary census unit, pcu^1 is the known data for the primary census unit at the specified time, and scu_1 and scu_2 are the data for the secondary census units for the district at the respective times.

In those instances where data for primary census units at both times were unknowns, the estimate for the secondary census unit was used. These would be cases in which the district did not exist at a prior time.

An ordered typology was constructed to show differential use of primary and secondary census unit data for variable estimation. It assigns a position to 172 of the 180 districts, ranging from I (use of primary census unit data only) to V (use of primary census unit data for three variables, secondary census unit data for three variables, and a combination for the other eight variables).

The following listing gives the units used for estimating each variable by typology rank. The typology ranks are referenced in the final tabulation of districts by these variable estimation claasifications:

I. Use of primary census unit data in 1940, 1950, and 1960 for these variables:

Level of wealth (not ascertained for 1940)
Distribution of wealth (not ascertained for 1940)
Sources of wealth
Stability of wealth
Stability of population
Occupational distribution (not ascertained for 1940, 1950)
Holding power of community
Age distribution

Racial composition
Size of district population
Education
Degree of urbanization (not ascertained for 1940, 1950)
Geographic isolation
Workers commuting outside community

II. Use of primary census unit data for all but two variables, sources of wealth and stability of population, for which secondary census unit data were used for 1940.

III. Use of primary census unit data for all but two variables. Secondary census unit data were used for 1940 on sources of wealth; they were used for 1940 and 1950 on stability of population.

IV. Use of primary census unit data for all but four variables. Secondary census unit data were used for 1940 on sources of wealth. They were used for 1940, 1950 and 1960 on stability of population, racial composition, and workers commuting outside community.

V. Use of primary census data for 1950 and 1960 on level of wealth and distribution of wealth, for 1960 on geographical isolation. Only secondary census unit data were used for stability of population, racial composition, and workers commuting outside community. 1940 secondary census unit data were used for the others, with 1950 and 1960 data being from primary census unit.

The remaining eight districts do not fit any of these types. Our description of them, with accompanying identifications, follows:

VI.1: Resembles Type I, except not reported in 1950 census; estimation based on average of 1960 and 1940 pcu/scu ratios.

VI.2: Resembles Type I, except data not available for pcu in 1940.

VI.3: Resembles Type I, except data not available for pcu in 1940 and 1950.

VI.4: Resembles Type III, except data not available for pcu in 1940.

Of the 172 districts classified, 153 were of Type I. Three were Type II; five were Type III; 10 were Type IV; and, one was Type V.

A similar typology was constructed to show use of primary and secondary unit data for level of wealth, extracted from noncensus sources.[2] All districts fit one of four classifications:

I. Use of primary unit data for 1940, 1950, and 1960.

II. Use of primary unit data for 1950 and 1960; use of secondary unit data for 1940.

III. Use of primary unit data for 1960; use of secondary unit data for 1940 and 1950.

IV. Use of secondary unit data for 1940, 1950 and 1960.

Of the 180 districts classified, 158 were of Type I. Three were Type II; six were Type III; and, 13 were Type IV. These are not cross-referenced in the final tabulation.[3]

The final tabulation, in Table B, gives the district name and numerical identification, its primary census unit -- and, where used, its secondary census unit, and its estimation classifications for area and variables.

---

[2] See Section F of Division XV for these sources.

[3] The three districts of Type II were: 025, 101, and 140; the six districts of Type III were: 990, 044, 079, 100, 132, and 137; the 13 districts of Type IV were: 018, 030, 039, 036, 052, 075, 076, 083, 087, 139, 141, 162, and 178.

Table B. Estimation Procedures by Sample Districts.*

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
	Alabama				
001	Escambia County School District	Escambia Co. minus Brewton and Atmore		A	I
002	Jefferson County School District	Jefferson Co. minus Birmingham, Bessemer, Fairfield, Mt. Brook, and Tarrant City		A	I
003	Mobile School District	Mobile Co.		A	I
004	Wilcox County School District	Wilcox Co.		A	I
	Arizona				
005	Isaac School District 5	Phoenix		E	I
006	Yuma School District 1	Yuma	Yuma Co.	K	III
007	Texarkana School District 7	Texarkana (.65) Miller Co. rural (.35)		F	I

* The weightings used are in parentheses.

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
008	Weona School District 29	Poinsett Co.		O	I
	California				
009	Bassett Elementary School District	West Covina, La Puente, and Baldwin Park	Los Angeles Co. minus Los Angeles	N	VI.3
010	Chico City High School District	Chico	Butte Co.	K	II
011	Fremont Union High School District	Santa Clara Co. minus Palo Alto, Mountain View, Los Gatos, San Jose, Santa Clara, Gilroy, Los Altos, Saratoga, Campbell, Morgan Hill, and Milpitas		A	I
012	Glendale Union School District	Glendale		B	I
013	Hayward Union High School District	Hayward, San Leandro, Castro Valley, and San Lorenzo		B	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
014	Lakeside Elementary School District	San Diego Co. minus San Diego		J	I
015	Los Angeles City High School District	Los Angeles		A	I
016	Los Angeles Elementary School District	Los Angeles		A	I
017	Los Angeles Junior College District	Los Angeles		A	I
018	McKinley Roosevelt Elementary District	Fresno Urbanized Area minus Fresno	Fresno Co.	E	VI.3
019	Modesto City Elementary School District	Modesto		A	I
020	Monterey City Elementary School District	Monterey and Seaside		D	I
021	Redondo Beach Elementary School District	Redondo Beach		A	I
022	Sacramento City School District	Sacramento Co. minus Sacramento (.50)	Sacramento (.50)	G	I
023	San Diego City School District	San Diego		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
024	Santa Ana City Elementary School District	Santa Ana		A	I
025	Stockton City School District	Stockton Urbanized Area	Stockton	B	VI.2
	Colorado				
026	Jefferson County School District R 1	Jefferson Co.		A	I
027	Westminster School District 50	Adams Co.		D	I
	Connecticut				
028	Bridgeport City Schools	Bridgeport		A	I
029	East Lyme Town Schools	New London Co. minus New London and Norwich		E	I
030	New Canaan Town Schools	New Canaan	Fairfield Co.	A	III
	District of Columbia				
031	District of Columbia Public Schools	District of Columbia		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
	Florida				
032	Dade County School District	Dade Co.		A	I
033	De Soto County School District	De Soto Co.		A	I
034	Hillsborough County School District	Hillsborough Co.		A	I
035	Orange County School District	Orange Co.		A	I
036	Sarasota County School District	Sarasota Co.		A	I
	Georgia				
037	Atlanta Independent School District	Atlanta		A	I
038	Colquitt County School District	Colquitt Co. minus Moultrie		A	I
039	Fitzgerald Independent School District	Fitzgerald	Ben Hill Co.	A	IV
040	Griffin Spalding School District	Spalding Co.		A	I
041	Jenkins County School District	Jenkins Co.		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit:				Estimation Classification:	
		Primary			Secondary	Area	Variable
	Hawaii						
042	Hawaii Public Schools	Hawaii				A	I
	Idaho						
043	Boise Junior College	Ada Co.				B	I
	Illinois						
044	Bellwood School District 88				Maywood	A	II
		1960	1950	1940			
	Bellwood	.67	.81	.85			
	Hillside	.04	...	...			
	Broadview	.03	.04	...			
	Stone Park	.13	...	...			
	Melrose Park	.12	.15	.15			
045	Board of Education, City of Chicago	Chicago				K	I
046	Decatur School District 61	Decatur				B	I
047	East St. Louis School District 189	East St. Louis and Washington Park				A	I
048	Newton Community High School District	Jasper Co.				L	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
049	Posen Robbins School District	1960 1950 Posen .33 ... Robbins .47 .69 Markham .09 .14 Harvey .11 .17	Harvey	B	V
050	Princeton High School District	Princeton	Bureau Co.	B	IV
	Indiana				
051	Beech Grove City Schools	Beech Grove	Marion Co. minus Indianapolis	A	III
052	Fort Wayne City Schools	Fort Wayne Urbanized Area	Fort Wayne	A	I
053	Metro School District, N. Posey County	Posey Co. minus Mt. Vernon		D	I
054	Prairie School Township	Henry Co. minus New Castle		O	I
055	Seymour Community School	Seymour (.75) Jackson Co. rural (.25)	Jackson Co.	F	III
	Iowa				
056	Newton Community School District	Newton		K	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
057	Sioux City Independent School District	Sioux City		A	I
058	Waterloo Independent School District	Waterloo		A	I
	Kansas				
059	Bucklin School District 75	Ford Co.		K	I
060	Wichita City School District	Wichita		A	I
	Kentucky				
061	Bell County School District	Bell Co. minus Middlesborough and Pineville		A	I
062	Hardin County School District	Hardin Co. minus Elizabethtown		A	I
063	Letcher County School District	Letcher Co. minus Jenkins		A	I
064	Whitley County School District	Whitley Co. minus Williamsburg and Corbin		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
	Louisiana				
065	De Soto Parish School District	De Soto Parish (Co.)		A	I
066	Morehouse Parish School District	Morehouse Parish (Co.)		A	I
067	St. Charles Parish School District	St. Charles Parish (Co.)		A	I
	Maine				
068	Portland City Schools	Portland		A	I
	Maryland				
069	Anne Arundel County Schools	Anne Arundel Co.		A	I
070	Baltimore City Schools	Baltimore		A	I
071	Montgomery County Schools	Montgomery Co.		A	I
072	Worcester County Schools	Worcester Co.		A	I
	Massachusetts				
073	Boston City Schools	Boston		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
074	Cambridge City Schools	Cambridge		K	I
075	Ipswich Town Schools	Ipswich	Essex Co. minus Lawrence	K	IV
076	Milton Public Schools	Milton	Quincy and Dedham	A	VI.1
	Michigan				
077	Chesaning Township School District 1	Saginaw Co. minus Saginaw		E	I
078	Detroit City School District	Detroit		A	I
079	Garden City School District	Garden City	Wayne Co. minus Detroit	A	I
080	Grand Rapids City Schools	Grand Rapids		A	I
081	Kearsley Rural Agricultural School District	Genesee Co. minus Flint		E	I
082	Muskegon Heights City School District	Muskegon Heights		A	I
083	Plainwell Community School District 1	Plainwell	Allegan Co.	A	IV

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
084	Sandusky Community School District 11	Sanilac Co.		D	I
	Minnesota				
085	Centerville Circle Pines Schools	Anoka Co. minus Anoka, Columbia Heights, Fridley City, and Coon Rapids		D	I
086	Minneapolis Special School 1	Minneapolis		A	I
087	Northfield School District 659	Northfield (.70) Rice Co. rural (.18) Dakota Co. rural (.12)	Rice Co. minus Fairbault	F	IV
	Mississippi				
088	Chickasaw County School System	Chickasaw Co. minus Houston and Okolona		A	I
089	Jones County School System	Jones Co.		A	I
090	South Pike Consolidated School District	Pike Co. minus McComb		K	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
	Missouri				
091	Arcadia Valley School District R 2	Iron Co.		L	I
092	Craig School District R 3	Holt Co.		E	I
093	Licking School District R 8	Texas Co.		E	I
094	St. Louis School District	St. Louis		A	I
095	Seneca School District C 7	Newton Co.		E	I
	Nebraska				
096	Hartington City School District 8	Cedar Co.		O	I
	Nevada				
097	Clark County School District	Clark Co.		A	I
	New Jersey				
098	Alpha Borough School District	Warren Co. minus Phillipsburg		O	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit:		Estimation Classification:	
		Primary	Secondary	Area	Variable
099	Newark City School District	Newark		A	I
100	New Providence Borough School District	New Providence	Union Co. minus Elizabeth	A	VI.4
101	Pennsauken Township School District	Pennsauken	Camden Co. minus Camden	A	VI.1
102	Rahway City School District	Rahway		A	I
103	Woodbridge Township School District	Woodbridge	Middlesex Co.	A	VI.1
	New Mexico				
104	Albuquerque School District	Bernalillo Co.		A	I
	New York				
105	Alden Central School District 1	Erie Co. minus Buffalo; plus Genesee Co. minus Batavia; plus Wyoming Co.		E	I
106	Buffalo City School District	Buffalo		A	I
107	Merrick Union Free School District 25	Hempstead		D	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
108	Islip Unified School District 3	Suffolk Co.		O	I
109	Maine Central School District 1	Broome Co. minus Binghampton; plus Tioga Co.		A	I
110	New York City School District	New York City		A	I
111	Oneida City School District	Oneida		D	I
112	Ossining Independent Unified Village District 1	Ossining (.75) Westchester Co. rural (.25)		F	I
113	Ramapo Central School District 2	Rockland Co.		E	I
114	Utica City School District	Utica		A	I
	North Carolina				
115	Alamance County Schools	Alamance Co. minus Burlington		B	I
116	Davie County Schools	Davie Co.		K	I
117	Johnston County Schools	Johnston Co.		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
118	Kinston City School	Kinston		K	I
119	Richmond County Schools	Richmond Co. minus Rockingham and Hamlet		B	I
120	Washington City Schools	Washington	Beaufort Co.	L	IV
	North Dakota				
121	Michigan Special School District 40	Nelson Co.		D	I
	Ohio				
122	Cincinnati City School District	Cincinnati, Cheviot, Amberley, and Golf Manor		A	I
123	Cleveland City School District	Cleveland			
124	Cleveland Heights City Schools	Cleveland Heights and University Heights		A	I
125	Columbus City School District	Columbus		A	I
126	Cuyahoga Falls City Schools	Cuyahoga Falls		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
127	Dayton City School District	Dayton		A	I
128	Deshler Local School District	Henry Co.		E	I
129	Jefferson Area Local Schools	Franklin Co. minus Columbus		E	I
130	Southeastern Local Schools	Ross Co. minus Chillicothe		O	I
131	Toledo City School District	Toledo		B	I
	Oklahoma				
132	Midwest City School District	Midwest	Oklahoma Co. minus Oklahoma City	L	VI.2
133	Oklahoma City School District	Oklahoma City		D	I
134	Varnum School District 7	Seminole Co. minus Seminole		E	I
	Oregon				
135	Brookings School District 17	Curry Co.		D	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
136	Pendleton School District 16	Pendleton (.70) Omatilla Co. rural (.30)		F	I
	Pennsylvania				
137	Conshohocken Borough School District	Conshohocken	Montgomery Co. minus Lower Merion	A	I
138	Elizabeth Forward Joint School District	Allegheny Co. minus Pittsburgh		E	I
139	Glassport Borough School District	Glassport	Allegheny Co. minus Pittsburgh	A	IV
140	Greenville Area Joint Schools	Greenville (.68) Mercer Co. rural (.32)	Mercer Co.	F	IV
141	N. E. Beaver County Merged Schools	Beaver Co. rural	Beaver Co.	P	I
142	Paoli Area Joint High Schools	Chester Co.		E	I
143	Philadelphia City Schools	Philadelphia		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
144	Scranton City School District	Scranton		A	I
145	Tredyffrn East Township Joint Schools	Chester Co.		E	I
146	York Suburban Joint Schools	York Co. minus York		E	I
	South Carolina				
147	Barnwell School District 45	Barnwell Co.		C	I
148	Georgetown County School District	Georgetown Co.		A	I
149	Orangeburg School District 3	Orangeburg Co.		D	I
	South Dakota				
150	Pierre Independent School District 1	Pierre	Hughes Co.	A	III
	Tenessee				
151	Dickson County School District	Dickson Co.		A	I
152	Jackson County School School District	Jackson Co.		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
153	Murfreesboro City Schools	Murfreesboro	Rutherford Co.	K	II
154	Robertson County School District	Robertson Co.		K	I
	Texas				
155	Abilene Independent School District	Abilene		A	I
156	Amarillo Independent School District	Amarillo		A	I
157	Coleman Independent School District	Coleman Co.		A	I
158	Dallas Independent School District	Dallas		A	I
159	Harlandale Independent School District	San Antonio		E	I
160	Houston Independent School District	Houston, West University Place, Bellaire, and Jacinto City (½)		B	I
161	Jayton Rural High School District	Kent Co.		C	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
162	La Vega Independent School District	Bellmead	McLennan Co. minus Waco	D	IV
163	Levelland Independent School District	Hockley Co.		C	I
164	Longview Independent School District	Longview		B	I
165	Pearsall Independent School District	Frio Co.		K	I
	Utah				
166	Granite School District	Salt Lake Co. minus Salt Lake City, West Jordan, Midvale, and Murray		B	I
	Vermont				
167	Montpelier City Schools	Montpelier	Washington Co.	A	IV
	Virginia				
168	Fairfax County Schools	Fairfax Co. minus Fairfax		A	I
169	Nansemond County School	Nansemond Co.		A	I
170	Norfolk City Schools	Norfolk		A	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
171	Tazewell County Schools	Tazewell Co.		A	I
	Washington				
172	Eastmont School District 26	Douglas Co.		B	I
173	Seattle School District 1	Seattle		A	I
174	Spokane School District 81	Spokane		B	I
	West Virginia				
175	Cabell County School District	Cabell Co.		A	I
176	McDowell County School District	McDowell Co.		A	I
177	Wetzel County School District	Wetzel Co.		A	I
	Wisconsin				
178	Blanchardville Joint School 1	Wisconsin (state) rural	Lafayette Co.	F	I

District No.	State/ District	Census Unit: Primary	Census Unit: Secondary	Estimation Classification: Area	Estimation Classification: Variable
179	Milwaukee City School District	Milwaukee		A	I
180	Stevens Point City Schools	Stevens Point		B	I